

law, and through whom we may obtain full and free pardon of all our transgressions. Rev. xi, 19; Heb. viii, 1-3.

To the professed people of God who still violate his law, we would address a word of exhortation and entreaty. "As though God did beseech you by us, we pray you in Christ's stead be ye reconciled to God." The carnal mind is enmity against God, and is not subject to his law. Pray that God may deliver you from it. Would you possess that charity or perfect love, so fully described in 1 Cor. xiii, which is the fulfilling of the law? Then heed the words of the apostle John: "This is the love of God that we keep his commandments; and his commandments are not grievous." 1 John v, 3.

The fourth commandment has long been trodden down, but under the latest message of mercy to men, the people of God are seen keeping all his commandments and the faith or testimony of Jesus Christ. Rev. xiv, 9-12. Will you not be of this number? The dragon is yet to make war upon this remnant of the church; but he shall not prevail. Rev. xii, 17. The last testimony respecting the commandment keepers is given by the Son of God in Rev. xxii, 14. "Blessed are they that do his commandments, that they may have right to the tree of life, and may enter in through the gates into the city." This is the fruition of our blessed hope, shortly to be realized.

J. N. A.

THE LAW OF GOD:

AN EXAMINATION

OF THE

TESTIMONY OF BOTH TESTAMENTS.

~~~~~  
BY J. H. WAGGONER.  
~~~~~

PUBLISHED AT THE ADVENT REVIEW OFFICE,

ROCHESTER, N. Y.

.....
1854.

THE LAW OF GOD:

AN EXAMINATION

OF THE

TESTIMONY OF BOTH TESTAMENTS.

BY J. N. WAGGONER.

PUBLISHED AT THE TRINITY BOOK CONCERN

ROCHESTER, N. Y.

1881

THE LAW OF GOD:

AN EXAMINATION OF THE TESTIMONY OF BOTH TESTAMENTS.

The acknowledged definition of *law* is, "A rule of action." Law, or rule, is necessary to the development of character. We can form no definite idea of the character of any man, except by comparing his life with a rule of right—something that will determine right from wrong. Hence by the law is the knowledge of sin. Rom. iii, 20. And character is not only *determined* by a comparison with, but it is *formed* in view of, the very existence of such rule or law; for sin is the transgression of the law. 1 John iii, 4. And in the entire absence of such a rule there is no moral character apparent; for where no law is, there is no transgression. Rom. iv, 15. Whenever, therefore, we find the recognition of wrong, wickedness, sin, or transgression, it presupposes, of necessity, the existence of a law. Law being a rule of right action, every transgression or sin, is, of course, wrong, and if indulged in with impunity, throws contempt upon the author of the rule. To vindicate and maintain the principles of justice, after such wrong doing, penalties were adopted as soon as man was created and placed on probation. All things were created for God's pleasure, [Rev. iv, 11.] and as the transgressor, instead of giving him glory, is

bringing his power and authority into contempt, [Jude 8,] it was determined of God that the soul that sinneth it shall die. Eze. xviii, 4. Thus the fact is established, and its justice must be approved, that the wages of sin is death. Rom. vi, 23.

A rule or law, to be of any force, must be given by authority, and to secure obedience, the author must be known to the individual amenable thereto. Then when we find any class of people spoken of as being wicked or sinners, [Gen. vi, 5; xviii, 20,] according to the above established facts, they must not only be transgressors of God's rule of action, but have a knowledge of the author of the law, and understand the nature of the act committed.

It has been said by some, that the knowledge of God in patriarchal times was confined to a few to whom he especially revealed himself, and that his law was not known to the inhabitants of the earth until it was given on Mount Sinai. To the first declaration we may say, that those of old who "received a good report through faith," were not the only ones who possessed a knowledge of God; but they were chosen, because they alone obeyed God. And the premises already established not only prove that God was known in patriarchal times, but the principles of his law were known and observed before the exodus from Egypt. From "righteous Abel" to Moses, the worthy ones were moved, not merely by a knowledge of the existence of God, (which knowledge was shared by Cain and the wicked in general,) but by faith in God. Thus Noah condemned the world, [Heb. xi, 7,] because he was righteous. Gen. vii, 1. The righteousness of Noah and Abraham was through faith in God's word: of course the unright-

eousness, or sin of those who were destroyed by the flood and at Sodom, was their disbelief and disobedience of God's rule or law; for sin is not imputed when there is no law. Rom. v, 13.

In addition to the propositions above stated, positive evidence may be adduced from the book of Genesis, and that part of Exodus covering the time prior to the giving of the law on Mount Sinai, which makes it perfectly clear that God has always had a revealed law as the rule of action for his creatures. This evidence may be arranged so as to bear on the following points, viz.:—

I. OF THE KNOWLEDGE OF GOD.

II. OF OFFERINGS TO THE LORD.

III. OF THE KNOWLEDGE OF SIN.

IV. KNOWLEDGE OF THE PRINCIPLES OF THE TEN COMMANDMENTS.

I. OF THE KNOWLEDGE OF GOD.

In the beginning God communicated with man in person. After the fall he continued to manifest his will to man, not only to the righteous, but to the wicked, as he conversed with Cain both before and after the murder of Abel. He talked with Noah, commanding him to make an ark, when he had determined to destroy the inhabitants of the world for their wickedness. After the flood, when Noah and his family were the only persons on the earth, the Lord spoke to them, [Gen. ix, 8,] giving the bow in the cloud, as a token of the promise made to them, which, at that time and under such circumstances, must have been well understood for many generations. An idea of the extent to which this direct knowledge must have been transmitted may be gained from the fact that Shem, the son of Noah, lived

more than two hundred years after the birth of Abram.

After Abraham had been called into the land of Canaan, God warned Abimelech, king of Gerar, concerning his wife. Gen. xx, 3-8. Some years after this, Abimelech desired to make a covenant with Abraham, because God was with him. Chap. xxi, 22, 23. When Abraham sent his servant to take a wife for Isaac, he found the knowledge of the Lord existing in the land whence he had come out. Chap. xxiv, 31. With Isaac also, the king of Gerar desired to make a covenant, because he saw that the Lord was with him. Chap. xxvi, 26-29. When Jacob wished to take his wives and return to his own country, Laban desired him to tarry, for he had learned that the Lord had blessed him for Jacob's sake. Chap. xxx, 25-27. And when Joseph advised the king of Egypt respecting the coming years of famine, Pharaoh said, Can we find such a one as this, a man in whom the Spirit of God is? Chap. xli, 34-38. But the evidence in proof of this point is also found in all the texts quoted under the other heads. Thus to show that an offering was made to the Lord, is to show that the one making the offering had a knowledge of the Being whose favor he sought by such an act.

II. OF OFFERINGS TO THE LORD.

Cain and Abel, the first born on earth, brought offerings to the Lord. Gen. iv, 3, 4. After the flood, Noah built an altar and offered burnt offerings thereon. Chap. viii, 20. When Abram came out from the land of the Chaldees, into the land of promise, and had come to Sichem, the Lord appeared to him, and he built an altar there to the Lord: going on, he

pitched his tent between Bethel and Hai, and there also he built an altar to the Lord, and called upon the name of the Lord. Chap. xii, 7, 8; xiii, 4, 18. When Jacob departed with his family from Shechem, he went to Bethel, and there built an altar to the Lord. Chap. xxxv, 3, 7. All the above passages furnish proof on the next point also, as no offerings (sacrifices) would have been made without a knowledge of sin.

III. OF THE KNOWLEDGE OF SIN.

When Cain was wroth because his sacrifice was not accepted, the Lord said to him, If thou doest well, shalt thou not be accepted? and if thou doest not well *sin* lieth at the door. Gen. iv, 7. And Lamech acknowledged his guilt, and that it called for vengeance. Verses 23, 24. Chap. vi, is the strongest possible proof on this subject: "And God saw that the wickedness of man was great in the earth, and every imagination of the thoughts of his heart was only evil continually." Verse 5. The earth was filled with violence. And God looked upon the earth and behold it was corrupt: for all flesh had corrupted his way upon the earth, Verses 11, 12. As a consequence, God said, I will destroy I man whom I have created, from the face of the earth. Verse 7. And behold I, even I, do bring a flood of waters upon the earth to destroy all flesh wherein is the breath of life from under heaven; and every thing that is in the earth shall die. Verse 17. Noah and his family were excepted. The Lord said, For thee have I seen righteous before me in this generation. Chap. vii, 1; compare with 1 John iii, 1. In connection with these facts we learn that Noah was a preacher of righteousness. (Right doing.)

2 Pet. ii, 5. And the destruction of the sinners was determined one hundred and twenty years before the flood, during which time Noah preached, and the Spirit of God strove with them. Gen. vi, 3; 1 Pet. iii, 18-20. Again, the men of Sodom were wicked and sinners before the Lord exceedingly. Gen. xiii, 13. Because the cry of Sodom and Gomorrah is great, and because their sin is very grievous. Chap. xviii, 20, Abraham interceded for the righteous, saying, Wilt thou also destroy the righteous with the wicked? Verse 23. We notice here that the character of the wicked appeared in the same light to God and to righteous men. Abraham knew that they were *wicked* and interceded only for the righteous. He knew that God would not regard the righteous as he did the wicked, and inquired, Shall not the Judge of all the earth do right? Verse 25. How should it be known that the Judge of all the earth judged righteously, unless the standard or rule (law) was known and approved as being in accordance with righteous principles? No one could approve the judgment of God without an acquaintance with his rule of judgment. See Rom. iii, 3-6. Lot also regarded them in the same light, and re-proved them for their wickedness. Gen. xix, 7. When Abraham denied his wife, and she was taken by Abimelech, God said he had withheld the king from sinning against him; and Abimelech told Abraham that he had brought on him and on his kingdom a great sin. Chap. xx, 2-9. These passages are sufficient to show that the knowledge of sin was general before the giving of the law to Israel. All the passages brought to sustain the remaining point, are also offered as proof on this.

IV. KNOWLEDGE OF THE PRINCIPLES OF THE TEN COMMANDMENTS.

When God renewed the promise to Isaac, he said he would perform the oath which he swore unto Abraham. "Because that Abraham obeyed my voice and kept my charge, my commandments, my statutes and my laws." Gen. xxvi, 5. As God is no respecter of persons, others might have shared the promise with Abraham if they had kept the commandments of God. But this they refused to do, and in consequence, suffered the displeasure of God for their transgressions. Thus the Apostle declares that the cities of the Plains were condemned with an overthrow in consequence of their "*unlawful deeds*." 2 Pet. ii, 6-8. Thus it is rendered clear that God had a revealed law before the time of the exode from Egypt.

Was this law the same that was afterwards declared on Mount Sinai? This question is one of the utmost importance, and I shall now endeavor to show from the word of God, that it was. Before direct testimony is presented from the book of Genesis to prove that the principles of the ten commandments were known in ancient times, let us examine a few texts from the New Testament, having a bearing on this subject.

Paul, in reasoning to the Romans on the sinful state of the world, and justification through faith in the blood of Christ, said, The law entered that the offense might abound. Rom. v, 20. Here sin abounded—but sin is the transgression of the law: therefore the law entered that the transgression of the law might abound. And in what manner? Evidently as it is expressed in a parallel passage,

[Chap. viii, 13.] that sin by the commandment might become exceeding sinful; as it is said again in Gal. iii, 19, that "it was added because of transgression." To make this clear to every mind, we use this illustration: A child has disobeyed its parent; now to convince the child of disobedience, or to make its sin more manifest, or exceeding sinful, some command of the parent is presented to his mind; and what one? Surely no other than the one transgressed. Would the crime of theft become odious in the sight of any one by having the sixth commandment presented? Or would the blasphemer stand reproved by telling him he should not steal? So, of course, the Israelites were "convinced of the law as transgressors" when God uttered his law from the Mount, and deposited it with them on tables of stone. Here were plainly brought to view the principles of love to God and men, to observe which, is the duty, and the whole duty, of man, [Matt. vii, 12; xxii, 37-40; Eccl. xii, 13,] but which none have perfectly observed, and all are therefore guilty before God. Rom. iii, 9-19, 22, 23. Let us notice the commandments separately.

1. When God spake from Sinai, he first commanded, "*Thou shalt have no other gods before me.*" This commandment not only forbids the holding of gods in preference to him, but also having them before him or in his presence: this would exclude the worship of false gods from all parts of the universe, all parts being present, or "naked and opened unto the eyes of him with whom we have to do." In considering this commandment, we can appreciate the remark of the Psalmist, "Thy commandment is exceeding broad." Ps. cxix, 96. As every individ-

ual is continually a transgressor who does not love God with all his heart, and has not chosen him as his chief good, every object of his pursuit is an idol preferred to God, whom he has rejected.

When Abraham's servant came to the house of Laban, he said, Come in, thou blessed of the Lord. Gen. xxiv, 31. Afterwards when Jacob had served his appointed time for his wives and desired to return to his own country, Laban requested him to remain because he had learned by experience that the Lord had blessed him for Jacob's sake. Chap. xxx, 27. Notwithstanding this acknowledgment of the true God, and that blessings proceeded from him, we find that he transgressed the first of God's commandments, and had other gods. When Jacob fled from Laban, he pursued him, but God appeared to Laban, and warned him not to touch Jacob; yet immediately after God had thus manifested himself to him, he accused Jacob of having stolen his gods. Jacob denied the charge, and said, with whomsoever thou findest thy gods let him not live. Chap. xxxi, 24, 29, 30, 32. When the two sons of Jacob had slain the Shechemites, Jacob was told to go to Bethel and build an altar unto God who appeared unto him. And Jacob said to his household, and to all that were with him, "put away the strange gods that are among you and be clean . . . and I will make an altar unto God who answered me in the day of my distress. Chap. xxxv, 1-4. Here it is not only evident that the first commandment was broken, but they understood that they were unclean in the sight of God, and not fit to approach the altar of God, while the strange gods were among them.

2. Idolatry is manifested in various ways, and the

gods anciently worshiped were of various kinds; while some worshiped the sun and the host of heaven, [Deut. iv, 19; xvii, 3,] others made to themselves images "fashioned with a graving tool." Ex. xxxii, 4; Isa. xl, 19, 20. Against this latter practice the second commandment was given: "*Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image . . . thou shalt not bow down thyself to them nor serve them.*" The gods that Laban had were of this kind: "And Laban went to shear his sheep, and Rachel had stolen the images that were her father's. Gen. xxxi, 19, 34, 35. The gods also that Jacob required his household to put away, were "among them, and in their hands." Chap. xxxv, 1-5.

3. *Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain.* No mention is made of this commandment or its transgression in the book of Genesis; but when the Lord took the children of Israel from Egypt to bring them into the land of Canaan, he said to them, "after the doings of the land of Canaan whither I bring you shall ye not do;" and in enumerating these doings he said, "neither shalt thou profane the name of thy God." "For all these abominations have the men of the land done which were before you, and the land is defiled." Lev. xviii, 3, 21, 27. These instructions were delivered to the Israelites within one year from the time that the law was given on Mount Sinai; for working these abominations the inhabitants of the land were defiled, [verse 24,] and the Lord abhorred and destroyed them in consequence of their wickedness. Lev. xx, 23; Deut. ix, 4, 5.; xviii, 12. If these nations, living in the land of Canaan before the law was given at Sinai, were ignorant of the matter of the third

commandment, then profanity was not an abomination in them—certainly not deserving of the punishment they received at the hand of the Lord; for "sin is not imputed when there is no law." Rom. v, 13.

The fourth commandment we omit for the present, and proceed to examine the other six.

5. *Honor thy father and thy mother.* Ham, the second son of Noah, transgressed this commandment and was cursed in consequence. Gen. ix, 21-25. Here also we may apply the rule laid down by the Apostle, [Rom. v, 13,] as quoted above.

6. *Thou shalt not kill.* Whatever excuses may have been framed for others on the ground of ignorance, Cain has been universally considered a murderer. God dealt with him as a transgressor of a known law; and an inspired writer has declared that he was "of the wicked one, and his works were evil." 1 John iii, 12. Lamech transgressed the same commandment, and judged himself more guilty than Cain. Gen. iv, 8-11, 23, 24. God made known to Noah his disapprobation of this sin. Chap. ix, 5, 6. Beyond this it might be urged that the principle of self-preservation would lead to human enactments, as safe-guards for human life, and that mere regard for such laws, deterred from the commission of this crime; but this reasoning will not hold good in the case of the Hebrew midwives, recorded in Ex. i, 16, 17. Here the command was to kill all the male children; but the midwives would not obey this human law; for "they feared God, and did not as the king of Egypt commanded them." Then they must have known that the law of man was contrary to the law of God.

7. *Thou shalt not commit adultery.* Numerous passages in the book of Genesis show that this was known to be sinful by mankind in general. When Abraham denied his wife and she was taken by the king of Gerar, the Lord suffered him not to touch her, and Abimelech said he had taken her in the integrity of his heart and innocency of his hands; and plead that Abraham had told him she was his sister; showing that he knew before that it would have been sinful to have taken another man's wife; and he said to Abraham, "thou hast brought on me and on my kingdom a great sin." Gen. xx, 5-9; xii, 12, 13, 18, 19; xxvi, 6-10. When Judah was made acquainted with the trespass of Tamar in this respect, he said, "bring her forth and let her be burnt." Chap. xxxviii, 24. In the absence of any revelation on this subject, it truly might be regarded as a singular fact that Judah had the same idea of the desert of this crime that the Lord revealed to Moses more than two centuries afterwards. See Lev. xxi, 9. Abimelech, king of Gerar, also took the wife of Isaac, supposing her to be his sister, and afterwards said to Isaac, "One of the people might lightly have lien with thy wife, and thou shouldest have brought guiltiness upon us." Chap. xxvi, 1, 10. Positive testimony is afforded on this point by the case of Joseph. Refusing to comply with the immodest request of his mistress he said, How then can I do this great wickedness and sin against God? Chap. xxxix, 7-9.

8. *Thou shalt not steal.* By reference to Gen. xxx, 33, it will be seen that Jacob and Laban understood the matter of this commandment. Laban reproved Jacob for stealing his gods. Chap. xxxi, 19, 30.

Now Jacob knew not that Rachel had stolen them, and gave sentence that whosoever the gods were found with should not live. Verse 32; see also verse 39. When Joseph's messenger accused his brethren of having stolen his silver cup, they declared their honesty in that they had brought again the money which they had found in their sacks' mouths, and said, "How then should we steal out of our lord's house silver or gold?" They made the same decision in this case that their father had made before them, namely; "With whomsoever of thy servants it be found, both let him die and we also will be my lord's bondsmen. Chap. xlv, 4-9."

9. *Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbor.* Nothing positive can be found in the book of Genesis relative to this particular commandment, but Joseph was wickedly imprisoned because his mistress bore false witness against him. Gen. xxxix, 7-20.

10. *Thou shalt not covet.* The transgression of this commandment is also rather implied than plainly brought to view; but the fact that the transgression of the tenth must precede the violation of the eighth, and that the eighth was known and its violation considered worthy of death, is sufficient evidence on this point for the present, as we intend to offer proof that the whole ten were known and observed before the days of Moses.

We now come to a consideration of the fourth commandment.

Remember the Sabbath-day to keep it holy; six days shalt thou labor and do all thy work; but the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God; in it thou shalt not do any work, thou nor thy son,

nor thy daughter, thy man-servant, nor thy maid-servant, nor thy cattle, nor thy stranger that is within thy gates; for in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day: wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath-day and hallowed it. ^XBefore giving testimony on this point we would quote the following appropriate remarks from Bro. J. N. Andrews:—

"In the absence of direct testimony either way, it is by no means certain that 'holy men of old' did not regard the Sabbath. We read of their reckoning time by weeks, and by sevens of days. Gen. xxix, 27, 28; viii, 10, 12. The reckoning of time by weeks is not derived from anything in nature, and can be traced to but one source, to wit: the six days' work of creation, and the rest of the seventh. It is not very likely that the work of creation should be remembered and commemorated, and the rest and sanctification of the holy Sabbath should be forgotten.

"But were it possible to show a violation of the Sabbatic institution in the Patriarchal age, it would no more destroy the sacred character of that institution, than a plain violation of the institution of marriage on the part of some of the Patriarchs affects the sacredness of the marriage institution. Mal. ii, 14, 15; Gen. ii, 21-24; Matt. xix. 4-8; Mark x, 6-8, compared with Gen. xvi; xxv, 6; xxix; xxx. Both of these institutions were made for man before the fall. Mark ii, 27; Gen. ii, 1-3; 1 Cor. xi, 12; Gen. ii, 18. Their sanctity is not derived from the Decalogue; but the fourth commandment guards the sacredness of one, and the seventh, the other. Gen. xx, 8-11, 14."

Our examination thus far proves that the distinct

precepts of the law were known before it was given on Mount Sinai; but the evidence in favor of the fourth commandment is more clear and positive than that adduced for any other; as this was not only known and observed, but its observance was enforced by the direct word of the Lord, before that event. Ex. xvi. In verses 22, 23, we find that a double amount of manna was gathered on the sixth day, and on that day Moses said, "To-morrow is the rest of the holy Sabbath unto the Lord." Again, in verse 26, "Six days ye shall gather it, but on the seventh day, which is the Sabbath, in it there shall be none." When some went out to gather on that day the Lord said, "How long refuse ye to keep my commandments and my laws? See, for that the Lord hath given you the Sabbath, therefore he giveth you on the sixth-day the bread of two days." Verses 28, 29. When the Lord expressed his intention of giving them the manna, he declared the object thus: "That I may prove them whether they will walk in my law or no." Verse 4. This in connection with verse 28, proves that the observance of the seventh day as the Sabbath was the law of God before it was proclaimed on Mount Sinai. It is also called "the rest of the *holy Sabbath* unto the Lord." Verse 23; how it came to be the "rest of the holy Sabbath" the commandment informs us: "In six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day." Thus it is not the Jews' nor ours, but Jehovah's Rest-day. He then blessed and hallowed it—thus it became the *holy Sabbath*. This whole transaction took place before the fall of man. Gen. ii, 1-3; therefore the Sabbath cannot be a type of anything

in the plan of human redemption. The types are declared to be "shadows of good things to come;" [Heb. x, 1:] but who will admit that man's rest is the substance, and God's rest a mere shadow? The commandment points back to creation—not forward to redemption. As the separate precepts of God's law were previously known, this must have been included among them; for by this precept he was to prove their obedience to his law. Ex. xvi, 4, 28.

Notwithstanding this clear testimony from God's word, objections are urged because the observance of the Sabbath was not *commanded* when the Sabbath was made; but this objection may also be urged against the other precepts, which are acknowledged to be moral in their nature, and forever binding; and the tenth, which H. H. Dobney, in his admirable argument on the law, says might be used "as a key to the whole, by showing that they extend to the heart," [Rom. vii, 7,] is not even mentioned as a known duty, or its violation noticed before its declaration on Mount Sinai. And I must express my deep regret that Mr. Dobney, while examining the six precepts on the second table, to show the essentiality of them all to the manifestation of our love to our neighbor, did not also severally examine the first four, and show their perfect adaptation to the development of love to God. As a whole he speaks of them as follows:—

"As to the *First* part, is it not well to call on the creature to love, and reverence, and worship, and obey his all-wise and kind Creator, Preserver, and Benefactor, to whom he owes life and breath and all things, and on whom he entirely depends? Must it not be right to love perfect excellence and goodness,

to submit to perfect wisdom, to manifest gratitude for kindness? Must it not be right to worship God? and if so, right to worship him in the way which he may see fit to prescribe? And if all this be right, is it not of course right to require it? And if so, would it not therefore be wrong to dispense with it? Then this first part of the law cannot be excepted against."—*Future Punishment*, page 43.

We will now come directly to the consideration of the law of God as a whole, trusting that our examination will justify the declaration of the Psalmist, that God's "righteousness is an everlasting righteousness," and all his "testimonies are founded forever." Ps. cxix, 142, 152.

When God renewed to Isaac the promise of the land, [Gen. xxvi,] he said, "I will perform the oath which I swore unto Abraham thy father; and I will make thy seed to multiply as the stars of heaven, and will give unto thy seed all these countries; and in thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed, because that Abraham obeyed my voice, and kept my charge, my commandments, my statutes, and my laws." Verses 3–5. We have already shown that not only Abraham, but mankind in general before and after his day, had a knowledge of the same precepts which we now call *moral law*. But this testimony of God's own words to Isaac is still more explicit, as the scriptures inform us that *all* God's holy commandments were observed by Abraham. In 1 Chron. xvi, 14–18, it is said: "He is the Lord our God; his judgments are in all the earth. Be ye mindful always of his Covenant, the word which he commanded to a thousand generations; which he made with Abraham, and his oath unto Isaac."

This can have no reference to the *promise* of the land to Abraham, as this is solely a "*covenant commanded*." "And hath confirmed the same to Jacob for a *law*, and to Israel for an everlasting covenant, saying, Unto thee will I give the land of Canaan, the lot of your inheritance." This *promise* of "the land of Canaan" cannot be the *covenant commanded*, or the *law*. A *promise* and a *command* are things essentially different. *Both* are embraced in the *Abrahamic Covenant*, according to this scripture, as is also shown in Gen. xxvi, 3-5, above quoted. Here the Lord says he will perform the oath which he swore unto Abraham; viz., to give him and his seed the land, *because* Abraham kept his commandments—his laws; which as we have seen, is a covenant commanded to a thousand generations, "confirmed to Jacob for a law, and to Israel for an everlasting covenant."

We find in the word of God many covenants as *promises*, or *mutual agreements*; [Gen. ix, 8, 13; xvii, 7; Ex. xix, 3, 8; Deut. v, 2; 2 Sam. xxiii, 5; Ps. lxxxix, 3, 4; Jer. xxxi, 31-35; Heb. viii, 7-13:] but only one covenant as a law, or commandment, namely, that upon which the promise to Abraham was based. Every promise of a blessing must be based upon some condition or command; for God's gracious purposes are toward the righteous, (doers of right, 1 John iii, 7,) and it cannot be determined who are righteous and who are wicked, unless we have a law for a standard of judgment. Rom. iii, 20; 1 John iii, 4. Whatever may be the opinions of men respecting this covenant commanded, the word of God is safer and more satisfactory, and to this alone we appeal. In Deut. iv, 12, 13, Moses

said to the children of Israel: "And the Lord spake unto you out of the midst of the fire; ye heard the voice of the words, but saw no similitude, only ye heard a voice, and he declared unto you his *covenant which he commanded you to perform, even ten commandments*. There is a manifest difference between *making* or *framing* a law, and *confirming* it. (See Webster.) Here we have a covenant of ten commandments *confirmed* to Jacob and Israel for an everlasting covenant, which Abraham kept, and thereby secured the promises, the fourth of which, guards the sanctity of the Sabbath. See Ex. xxxiv, 28. We are also informed that God's holy covenant, which he confirmed to Israel and wrote on two tables of stone, contained only ten precepts or commandments. In Deut. v, 22, it is said, "These words the Lord spake unto all your assembly, in the mount out of the midst of the fire, of the cloud, and of the thick darkness, with a great voice; *and he added no more*; and he wrote them in two tables of stone, and delivered them unto me." Compare Ex. xx, 3-19; xxxi, 18; xxxiv, 28; Deut. iv, 12, 13; ix, 9-11. But many since that day have had "indignation against the holy covenant" and forsaken it, [Dan. xi, 30,] and to avoid its observance they endeavor to set aside the testimony of the holy men of old who have spoken in its favor. With many professed Bible students the writings of the Old Testament, are a mere dead letter; they boast much of the New Testament without considering the relation it bears to the Old. Such a feeling, I think, would never have obtained a place in their breasts had it not been fostered by their desire to avoid the fourth precept in God's law. How far this feeling is just,

we may judge from what is said of the Old Testament writings in the New Testament. See Luke xxiv, 44; John v, 39, 46; 2 Pet. i, 21; Acts xvii, 2, 3; xviii, 28; 2 Tim. iii, 15-17. Mark well this last scripture: Paul can have no reference here to the New Testament, but those scriptures which Timothy had known "from a child." Much of the New Testament was written within a few years of the time that Paul wrote thus to Timothy; and some important parts, as the Gospel according to John, and the Book of Revelation were not written till many years after. He must, of course, have referred to the scriptures existing in the childhood of Timothy, (the Old Testament,) and declared they were able to make him "wise unto salvation through faith which is in Christ Jesus;" "given by inspiration of God . . . profitable . . . that the man of God may be *perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works.*" Solomon received special wisdom from God, and he declared that to fear God and keep his commandments, was the *whole duty of man*. These commandments, as we have seen, were ten in number. If God ever gave a law which was "*perfect*"—embracing in its requirements "the whole duty of man," reason would teach us that no change in dispensation could make any change in such a law. But if a change were effected, it must certainly be the result of a clear necessity; and such change and necessity must be made apparent to all who were amenable to the law in its first form. Now we would inquire, if, amid all the prophecies speaking of the Advent of the Messiah and his glorious ministration under the New Testament, any intimation is given of a change in the law of God, or the substitu-

tion of a new one? The law was perfect, and could not be better—consequently no such thing could be expected in the prophets, neither is it found in the New Testament. To satisfy the mind on this point, we will inquire, What relation do we, as Christians, sustain to the purposes of God as revealed in the Old Testament? To ascertain this, we must examine briefly the promises made to Abraham and to David.

1. PROMISES TO ABRAHAM.—God made a promise to Abraham to give him and his seed the land; [Gen. xii, 7;] for an everlasting possession; [Chap. xvii, 8;] this inheritance he did not receive; [Acts vii, 2-5; Heb. xi, 13;] Christ is the seed to whom the promises were made; [Gal. iii, 16, 19;] we receive the inheritance by joint heirship with him; [Rom. viii, 16, 17;] hence, they that are Christ's are Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise. Gal. iii, 29. It has been shown from scripture that Abraham kept God's holy covenant of ten commandments, and they who are faithful are blessed with him. Gal. iii, 9. But we are informed by the Saviour, that if we are Abraham's children we will do the works of Abraham. John viii, 39. Faith in Christ does not, as some argue, release us from the obligation to keep God's holy law, any more than it did Abraham. See John viii, 56; Rom. iv, 1-3, 21-24; Gal. v, 6; James ii, 17, 21, 22, 26. But whatever may be our birth or profession, if we do not the works of Abraham we are not his children. John viii, 44; Rev. iii, 9. We would here suggest a few inquiries for the consideration of those who acknowledge no obligation to any law existing previous to the coming of Christ: 1. To what dispensation

do we look for our father in the faith? 2. Do Christians have any law of which Abraham was ignorant? 3. Did Abraham have any law which was not revealed to Moses? See Gal. iii, 8; Heb. iii, 17-19; iv, 1, 2; xi, 39; 1 Cor. x, 1-4.

2. PROMISES TO DAVID.—God promised to David to establish his kingdom and throne forever. 1 Chron. xvii, 11-14; Ps. lxxxix, 3, 4, 20-36. In this last quotation there is a condition stated, the non-observance of which would result in the punishment of his children, or the temporary subversion of the kingdom; yet the Lord declares in verses 33-36, that his faithfulness shall not fail. Notwithstanding their disobedience and consequent punishment, he would perform his promise to David, and establish his throne forever. The condition is expressed in verses 30-32: "If his children forsake my law and walk not in my judgments, if they break my statutes and keep not my commandments, then will I visit their transgressions with the rod, and their iniquities with stripes." But the children of Israel did transgress the law of God: "And the Lord said, Because they have forsaken my law which I set before them, and have not obeyed my voice, neither walked therein, but have walked after the imagination of their own heart, and after Baalim, which their fathers taught them; therefore thus saith the Lord of hosts, the God of Israel; Behold I will feed them, even this people, with wormwood, and give them water of gaul to drink, I will scatter them also among the heathen, whom neither they nor their fathers have known; and I will send a sword after them till I have consumed them." Jer. ix, 13-16. But God continued to call after them, and again told the

Prophet: "And thou shalt say unto them, Thus saith the Lord, If ye will not hearken to me, to walk in my law, which I have set before you, to hearken to the words of my servants, the Prophets, whom I sent unto you, both rising up early and sending them, but ye have not hearkened; then will I make this house like Shiloh; and I will make this city a curse to all the nations of the earth." Jer. xxvi, 4-6. Still they would not hear, and he testified against them: "They are not humbled, even unto this day, neither have they feared, nor walked in my laws, nor in my statutes, that I set before you and before your fathers." Jer. xlv, 10. Therefore he saith, "Set the trumpet to thy mouth. He shall come as an eagle against the house of the Lord, because they have transgressed my covenant and trespassed against my laws." Hos. viii, 1. In Matt. xxi, 33-43, the Saviour brings this matter before the Jews, in the parable of the husbandmen, who would not render to the householder the fruits of the vineyard, but beat and stoned his messengers, and finally killed his Son, the heir, in order to seize the inheritance. His hearers passed sentence that the lord of the vineyard will destroy them and let it out to others who will render him the fruits in their seasons. He makes the application to them thus: "Therefore I say unto you, the kingdom of God shall be taken from you, and given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof." What fruit was required of them? They were required to keep the commandments of God, which he had set before them and before their fathers. Is it not evident that the same fruit, or the keeping of the same law is required of that nation to whom it was given? Therefore he said—"Whosoever shall

break one of these least commandments, and shall teach men so, he shall be called the least (shall be in no esteem—Campbell.) in the kingdom of heaven; but whosoever shall do and teach them, the same shall be called great in the kingdom of heaven." Matt. v, 19. Here the consequences of keeping this law, reach to the kingdom of heaven, and are not confined to the Jewish age or dispensation. Love to God, and obedience to his law, are the "fruits of the kingdom." The kingdom is "promised to them that love him; [Jas. ii, 5;] and "this is the love of God that we keep his commandments." 1 John v, 3. Thus we have the most conclusive evidence from the scriptures of truth, that the *covenant* that Abraham kept was the law of *ten commandments* written on the tables of stone, the *perfect law confirmed* to Israel, *ratified* by Christ in his teachings, and *established* by the faith of the gospel.

To those who say we are fallen from grace, or are under the curse, for keeping the ten commandments, we would propose the following questions: 1. If the Gentiles obtain the kingdom by bringing forth other fruits than those required of the Jews, where is it recorded in God's word? 2. If we are cursed for keeping the same law that the Jews were cursed for transgressing, how is that fact reconciled with the character of God as given in Mal. iii, 6, and James i, 17?

In our examination thus far we have seen, *first*, that the law existed before the *Jewish dispensation*; hence, it cannot be peculiar to that dispensation; and *second*, by the relation that we sustain to the promises of God having the law for their basis, or condition, that it comes down unchanged into the

present dispensation; and there is a perfect harmony in the writings of the Old and New Testaments on this subject. We will here place some of their testimony side by side:—

OLD TESTAMENT.	NEW TESTAMENT.
Deut. viii, 1.—All the commandments which I command thee this day shall ye observe to do, that ye may live.	Matt. xix, 17.—If thou wilt enter into life, keep the commandments.
Ecd. xii, 13.—Fear God and keep his commandments, for this is the whole duty of man.	Rom. ii, 13.—The doers of the law shall be justified.
Ps. xix, 8.—The law of the Lord is perfect, . . . the statutes of the Lord are right. . . the commandment of the Lord is pure.	Rom. vii, 12.—Wherefore the law is holy, and the commandment holy, and just, and good.
Verse 7.—The law of the Lord is perfect, converting the soul.	Gal. iii, 24.—Our schoolmaster, to bring us unto Christ, that we might be justified by faith.
Ps. cxix, 7.—I delight in thy law; also, verses 16, 24, 35, 47, 77, 92, 127, 143, 174.	Rom. vii, 22.—I delight in the law of God.
Eze. xx, 19, 20.—Walk in my statutes and keep my judgments, and do them, and hallow my Sabbaths, and they shall be a sign between me and you that ye may know that I am the Lord your God.	1 John ii, 3.—And hereby we do know that we know him if we keep his commandments.
Isa. xlii, 21.—The Lord is well pleased for his righteousness' sake; he will magnify the law, and make it honorable.	Rom. iii, 31.—Do we then make void the law through faith? God forbid; yea, we establish the law.

Eze. xx, 11.—I gave them my statutes and shewed them my judgments, which if a man do he shall even live in them.

Prov. xxviii, 9.—He that turneth away his ear from bearing the law, even his prayer shall be abomination.

Rom. vii, 10.—The commandment was ordained to life.

Matt. xv, 9.—But in vain they do worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men.

Beginning with the Abrahamic Covenant, we find a mass of testimony which it is impossible to evade, that the law of God, the ten commandments, are ever binding—that under all dispensations mankind are under the same obligation to observe them, and that they are viewed in the same light by the writers of both Testaments. But the “carnal mind” is particularly manifested in opposition to the fourth precept; and we will further notice some of the reasons why it should be observed, and the objections urged against it.

In Ex. xxxi, 13, the Sabbath is declared to be a sign between God and the children of Israel, that they might know that he was the Lord that sanctified them. An objection has been urged here that this referred to none but the children of Israel, and can have no reference to Christians of Gentile birth. Who, then, are the children of Israel referred to in this scripture? Certainly not rebellious, unconverted Jews; for they are not sanctified, and, therefore, are not entitled to the sign thereof. Not all the literal descendants of Jacob; for “they are not all Israel which are of Israel.” Rom. ix, 6. “Neither because they are the seed of Abraham are they all children.” Verse 7. Jacob was the first that was called Israel; but he was not called Israel till he pre-

vailed with God. Gen. xxii, 28. Then it is evident that they who prevail with God are truly Israel—they are sanctified. Compare Gen. xxi, 12; Rom. ix, 7, with Matt. iii, 9; John viii, 39; Rom. iv, 11; Gal. iii, 7, 9. But it must be evident to every one that the rebellious, “carnal mind,” cannot keep the Sabbath “according to the commandment.” See Ex. xx, 8; Isa. lviii, 13.

If this sign (the Sabbath) was given to the Jews alone, as some claim, then those who live in the present dispensation should not boast over them, as some do, since they enjoyed one privilege or blessing that nothing revealed compensates for the loss of; namely, the possession of a sign, and thereby the certain knowledge of their sanctification. Strike this from existence, and we search the sacred page in vain for a substitute. How many are “deceiving and being deceived” in this day of strong delusions; and how precious to the humble soul the God-given sign of sanctification! In the light of this fact we could no sooner think that the Sabbath was a Jewish institution, than that sanctification was a Jewish grace, not fitted for the “Christian dispensation.”

It is also urged that the *reason* given for the observance of the Sabbath was one bearing only on the Jews; viz., deliverance from bondage; [Deut. v, 15;] but it is evident from the reading of the passage that Moses was rehearsing to them matters with which they were already acquainted. Thus in verses 4, 5, he says the Lord talked with them, and he stood between the Lord and them; and in verse 12, he tells them to keep the Sabbath-day to sanctify it, as the Lord thy God *hath com-*

manded thee; and that the Sabbath should be observed "that thy man-servant and thy maid-servant may rest as well as thou." This he urges on *them* by the consideration that they were servants in the land of Egypt; but this does not argue that the Sabbath was not "made for man," as the obligation to give rest to "thy man-servant, and thy maid-servant," is stated in the commandment as given by Jehovah. Ex. xx, 10. The Israelites had received the institution of the Passover to commemorate their deliverance from Egypt; [Ex. xii;] and Moses does not, in Deut. v, speak of observing the Sabbath as a memorial of that event. God speaks his law for "all the world," [Rom. iii, 19,] and, therefore, does not mention the deliverance from Egypt in the fourth commandment, but the creation of heaven and earth, and the rest and sanctification of the Sabbath, at the end of the first week of time.

But whatever may be urged against the fourth commandment on the ground of its being Jewish, may also be urged against other commandments, and with equal force. The Sabbath was "made for man" at creation; it was blessed and sanctified at that time; [Gen. ii, 1-3;] its sanctity was declared, and its observance enforced before the other precepts of the law were given from Mount Sinai. Ex. xvi. When spoken there it was called the Sabbath [Rest] of the Lord—not of the Jews—because *he* rested, before any distinction of Jew and Gentile *could* be known. Ex. xx, 11. It was made a sign of the knowledge of God, and their sanctification. Ex. xxxi, 13. After the passion of our Saviour is foretold in Isa. liii, and through him the faithfulness and surety of God's promises, [chap. liv,] the invitation

is given to *every one* that thirsteth to come; and "nations that know not thee shall run unto thee;" [chap. lv;] therefore "the son of the stranger" may join himself to the Lord, and be brought to his holy mountain, and made joyful in his house of prayer, by keeping the Sabbath from polluting it, and taking hold of his covenant; for his house shall be called an house of prayer for *all people*; [chap. lvi;] after their unfaithfulness is reproved, [chap. lvii,] and their hypocrisy, [chap. lviii, 1, 2,] he promises that they shall delight themselves in the Lord, and feed on the heritage of their father Jacob, [Israel,] if they turn away their feet from the Sabbath, from doing their pleasure on his holy day, &c. / Verses 13, 14. Thus the Sabbath is brought down by the Prophets, beyond the first advent of Christ, and to the coming of the nations to him in the present dispensation. Christ never broke the Sabbath, though often accused by the Jews of so doing. And it is well worthy of note, that, while the Jews were untiring in their efforts to sustain charges against his disciples, no accusation of Sabbath-breaking was made after the crucifixion.

With this testimony compare the evidence for the fifth commandment. There is only one place, [Gen. ix,] from which even an inference could be drawn that this commandment was known before the Israelites came to Sinai. Here it was given, (as our opponents claim,) not to, or for, the world, but the Jews alone; consequently the motive presented for its observance must be peculiar to the Jews. And as the objector claims that the Sabbath was only for them, as they alone had been delivered from Egypt; so the fifth was only for them, as they alone were

brought into the land of Canaan. See Ex. xx, 12. Paul speaks of this in Eph. vi, 2, as the "first commandment with promise;" but no promise is referred to but that given to the Jews on their way to Canaan. Can this be enforced on Gentiles in this dispensation, any more than the fourth commandment? And why need it? If fathers may break, with impunity, the fourth precept in God's holy covenant, may not their children, with equal propriety, break the fifth? See Mal. i, 6; ii, 7.

Again, it may as well be claimed that the second commandment is "modified" or "relaxed" under this dispensation, if not entirely "done away." Idolatry may be manifested in various ways—the first commandment forbids it in general, the second in one particular. Then the argument may be stated thus, in the language of our opponents:—"These particular forms of prohibition were well enough for the Jewish dispensation, where they, no doubt, served their purpose; but they are altogether unsuitable for the present dispensation. If it is wrong to make and worship graven images now, that fact must be plainly stated in the New Testament. But the declarations of the Apostle forbid such an idea: he plainly declares that 'covetousness is idolatry,' and we do well not to be 'wise above what is written.'" It must be evident that those who endeavor to prove the abolition of God's holy Sabbath, cannot from the scriptures, enforce obedience on the part of their children, or convince the Pagan or Papist of sin. All the arguments generally used against the fourth commandment may also be urged against the first. Then the first, second, fourth and fifth would meet a like fate at the hands of those who, to avoid the

observance of God's holy day, strike a death-blow at his holy law, and endeavor to detract the justice and judgment which are the habitation of his throne.

Another method of avoiding the fourth precept in God's law, is to say that it was all the law of Moses; and Christ came and died to abolish it, and free us from its yoke. But I am unable to discover that Christ either came or died to abolish any law whatever. Would it not be a truly singular fact that God should give a law as a rule whereby moral agents were to develop their characters, so unfitted to the end for which it was given, that he was obliged to send his Son to die and release us from the obligation to keep it? This is not only making God such an one as themselves, but it is bringing him, unchangeable as he has declared himself to be, far below our sense of right and justice. But there is no such thing found in the word of God. "Christ died for our sins according to the scriptures." Sin existed before the Levitical law. To say that Christ died to abolish the law of Moses, is like saying that the traveler pursues his journey expressly to pass the mile-stones. He travels to reach a certain destination, and the mile-stones must necessarily be left behind. That was a system of types and shadows—when the substance is reached we follow the shadow no further. But there must be a substance before a shadow can be cast. Christ was as a lamb "slain from the foundation of the world." Rev. xiii, 8. He did not come to die, merely because that system of types was instituted, and needed to be removed; but that was instituted because he was coming to die. The objection reverses the true order of things, by placing the cause for the effect;

and must arise from taking a very superficial view of the work of our Saviour. In connexion with this, it has been said that the law which governed men under the former dispensation was faulty, and Christ came to take it away and introduce a better. This objection is raised from a perversion of Heb. viii, in making the "first covenant," read *first law*. We have before shown that the term covenant is used in different senses, and the remarks of the Apostle on the two covenants, which may be noticed hereafter, forbid the idea that any candid searcher for truth should be so mistaken. Before his death, the Saviour prayed, "O, my Father if it be possible let this cup pass from me." But it was not possible. He drank the cup prepared and imbittered by our sins. But if our sins were the transgressions of an imperfect, faulty law, all must admit that the law might have been set aside, and the transgressor freed from its yoke, without the death of the Son of God. And indeed it admits of a query, whether the transgression of a faulty, good-for-nothing law is morally wrong. In such a case the fault need not be reckoned on the part of the transgressor, but on the part of the Law-giver. If God gave man a faulty, imperfect law, which had a curse necessarily attached to it, as some claim, and man failed to develop a perfect, moral character under it, and was thereby lost, where would the blame rest? And would not God, under such circumstances, be unrighteous in taking vengeance? Rom. iii, 5.

That the law of moral precepts, the transgression of which occasioned the death of the Son of God, is distinct from that law of types and shadows, which was instituted in view of his death, is so plainly re-

vealed in the scriptures, that it would seem impossible for any candid Bible student to deny it. Yet it is denied; and as we have quoted passages to show the perfect agreement of the writers of the two Testaments, when referring to God's holy law, it may be profitable to show their different methods of speaking of that, and the ceremonial or Levitical law.

MORAL LAW.

Ps. xix, 11.—In keeping of them (commandments) there is great reward.

Ps. xix, 7.—The law of the Lord is perfect, converting the soul.

Matt. v, 19.—Whosoever, therefore, shall break one of these least commandments and shall teach men so, he shall be called the least in the kingdom of heaven: but whosoever shall do, and teach them, the same shall be called great in the kingdom of heaven.

Ps. cxix, 152.—Concerning thy testimonies, I have known of old that thou hast founded them forever. See verse 160.

Rom. vii, 14.—For we know that the law is spiritual.

CEREMONIAL LAW.

Heb. vii, 18.—For verily there is a disannulling of the commandment going before for the weakness and unprofitableness thereof.

Heb. x, 1.—For the law having a shadow of good things to come, and not the very image of the things, can never with those sacrifices which they offer year by year continually, make the comers thereunto perfect.

Acts xv, 24.—Forasmuch as we have heard that certain which went out from us have troubled you with words, subverting your souls, kingdom of heaven: but saying, Be circumcised and keep the law, (see verse 5,) to whom we gave no such commandment.

Heb. ix, 10.—Which stood only in meats and drinks, known of old and carnal ordinances imposed on them till the time of reformation.

Heb. vii, 16.—Who is made, not after the law of a carnal commandment.

If one and the same law is spoken of in all these passages, then we may despair of ever arriving at correct conclusions from such contradictory statements. By comparing Matt. v, 19, with Acts xv, 24, it will be seen that if the same law is referred to, the Apostles have deprived themselves of the promised blessing "in the kingdom of heaven;" but when we consider that the "law of Moses" was the subject of debate in the Apostolic council, all is plain. See Acts xv, 5-10.

It is plain that Christ did not die to abolish any law; [Matt. v, 17-19:] but to redeem us from the transgression of his Father's law that the sinner condemned to death, [Rom. vi, 23,] should not perish, but have everlasting life. John iii, 16. If the next position of the objector is true, viz., that he came to introduce a new and better law, then we may safely say his mission was completely a failure: for no such law is found in the teachings of Christ or his apostles. Here we will venture the assertion that *no new principle of morality is taught in the New Testament*. Then where is that law *better* than the *perfect* one previously given? ~~X~~ None of the scriptures teach that Christ came as a law-giver, but as a Saviour from sin. ~~X~~ Neither can it be true that he altered or relaxed the law of God in any particular. But if that was abolished, what became of the first commandment? The answer to this question, as an opposer gave it to me, was, that only the *ceremonial* part of the law (the fourth precept) was abolished, and the remainder greatly enlarged—that the principle of the first commandment could be discovered in the writings of the Apostles. Then in the former dispensation, it was fully declared in def-

inite terms: in the present, we must endeavor to trace the principle in the writings of the Apostles, who do not make any particular mention of it. An enlargement truly from definite to indefinite! Part of a perfect law abolished—other parts obscured, and thus it is incomparably better than it was before! But inasmuch as that is the only moral code ever given, and the New Testament brings to light no new principles of morality, but only *ratifies* and *establishes* those taught in the Old, [see Matt. v, 17-19; Rom. 3, 31; 2 Tim. iii, 15-17,] can those who say that the law was for the Jews only, show that any moral law was ever given to the Gentiles? or prove that the Gentile world was ever designed to be placed under moral restraint? And if the offense of the Jews, as has been shown from the scriptures, was the transgression of that law, why are they not restored to the favor of God, if that law is abolished?

But if it could be shown that another law had been given in the New Testament, why should it be called a *better law* than that given on Mount Sinai? Could it be more just in its nature? That was perfect. Could it be more replete with moral obligations? That embraced the whole duty of man. Could its observance tend to better results? That was ordained to life. Rom. vii, 10; Lev. xviii, 5; Eze. xx, 11; Matt. xix, 17. Is it contended that that produced the death of the transgressor, [Rom. vi, 23,] insomuch that it is even called death, [2 Cor. iii, 7,] because all have transgressed it? Rom. iii, 23. We would then inquire, Has God ever promised life to the disobedient, even in the New Testament? Does the Gospel justify all, without distinction of character? Our opponents boast of the Gospel of

Christ as though it was impossible for the most incorrigible sinner to die, since the ushering in of the present dispensation! But can they show that the law would ever curse those who obeyed it, or that the gospel will save those who disobey it? 2 Thess. i, 7, 8. The light of the Gospel results in the condemnation of those who reject it. John iii, 19. Jesus said, "If I had not come and spoken unto them, they had not had sin; but now they have no cloak for their sin." John xv, 22. Could not the Jews, therefore, claim, with equal propriety, that the Gospel of Christ was a curse unto them? Again, Paul says of himself and fellow-laborers in the Gospel, [2 Cor. ii, 15, 16,] that they are unto God a sweet savor of Christ in them that perish—even the savor of death unto death. Why do not our opponents reject the Gospel for all these things?

But further, if that law was perfect, embracing in its requirements the whole duty of man, (and so it must have been, or the scriptures are not true,) then every principle of morality that could arise out of our relation to God or our fellow-men must have been embraced in it. To suppose otherwise, were to suppose that God did not require holiness under the past dispensation; but this supposition is contradicted by his word. Lev. xi, 44. If all the moral duties growing out of our relation to God and our fellow-creatures were included in that, then none remained to be added thereafter; and if that be abolished, and another substituted, the one so substituted must be as extensive in its requirements as that was, or else it would not include the whole duty of man, and hence would be imperfect; but such a law (an imperfect one) will not be contended for. Therefore we

will consider it granted that the *new law* must be as comprehensive as the old one. But it is not possible to even imagine how such a thing can be, *unless the two laws are exactly alike!* I can no more comprehend the existence of two complete, perfect rules of moral action, both embracing the whole duty of man, yet different, than I can comprehend the existence of two supreme Deities, both essentially holy in their natures, yet not alike. And we hazard nothing in saying that it is just as impossible for God to create two different, complete rules of moral action, as to create a duplicate of himself. An examination of this declaration is only needed to satisfy any one of its correctness.

The Apostle Peter, exhorting to obedience and holiness, says, [1 Pet. i, 15, 16,] "But *as* he which hath called you is holy, *so* be ye holy in all manner of conversation. ~~Because it is written,~~ Be ye holy, for I am holy." See Lev. xi, 44; xix, 2; xx, 26. Is not the requirement for holiness the same in both Testaments? we are required to be holy, because God is holy, and we are to be like him. So the Saviour said: "Be ye therefore perfect, even as your Father which is in heaven is perfect." ~~Matt. v, 48.~~ And this is not an unreasonable requirement—only equivalent to that of loving God with all the heart. It is an acknowledged law of the human mind that man is assimilated to the object of his worship. If he worships a being of a depraved character, the more he contemplates the character of that being—the more he loves it, the more degraded and depraved he becomes. Witness the heathen nations, who worship monstrous beings of various kinds, and themselves become monsters of depravity. On the other

hand, if the object of his worship is possessed of a pure and lovely character, the more worshipful and devoted he is, the more lovely he will become in temper and disposition. An intelligent being, possessed of creative power—in other words, being supreme—must have the right to command the worship of his creatures; and if so, to prescribe also the form of worship; (without which the command would be a nullity;) his own character being an index to the form of worship prescribed. The character of God is declared in the passages referred to—he is holy; and also in 1 John iv, 8, “God is love.” These declarations of the character of God are a sufficient guarantee that a system or form of worship, or rule of action, required by him, would be perfect, holy, like his own character, the embodiment of love. For such a being to require the creature to love and adore him, is only to provide for the creature’s own best good—to point out the way whereby the created being may be like his Creator—pure, lovely, holy, and of course, happy. The idea of obedience to right laws tending to the happiness of the moral agent, has been beautifully illustrated by a late writer:—

“Happiness depends on the state of our minds, and the feelings which are prevalent there. Now the law of God prescribes exactly that class of affections, and that only, which invariably and necessarily produces enjoyment in the existence and exercise of them—Love. ‘Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind, and with all thy strength; and thy neighbor as thyself.’ And so ‘Love is the fulfilling of the law.’

“Allow the imagination to bring such a state of mind before you as your own; just try the experiment of imagining how you would feel, if every selfish, unlovely emotion, had become utterly extinct, leaving no trace behind, and pure love to all beings animated your breast; the heart filled with holy love and reverence for God, so that you exulted in your relation to him, and delighted in all his will; love to God supremely, and to all his creatures subordnately—why, your cup would be full to overflowing, and you would be ready to shout aloud for joy. Thus admirably is God’s law adapted to secure the perfect happiness of every one that observes it. Thanks be to God for such a law!”—*Dobney*, pp. 46, 47.

That God designed that his creatures should be holy and happy, none can deny; and that obedience to his law was the appointed means to secure this very desirable state, is equally evident from the reasons and scriptures offered above; and other scriptures declaring that righteousness consists in keeping the law. *Dent. vi, 25.* His law is the transcript of his own divine mind, the revelation of his holy will. The keeping of his law is his own prescribed form of worship; and no worship is acceptable without it. Therefore he says, “He that turneth away his ear from hearing the law, even his prayer shall be abomination.” *Prov. xxviii, 9;* see also, *Matt. xv, 9.* How can any one become like God—holy—without worshipping him? And how can any one worship him and not keep his commandments? These contain his own prescribed rule, or standard of holiness. But if that law was the rule whereby man might become like God, holy, in the former dispensation, can any other rule be follow-

ed in this dispensation, and the agent still develop a holy character? Or in other words, has God's holiness changed in its nature, or is it the same that it was in times past? Thus we see there is a material point at issue. As God requires his creatures to be holy, he must give them a rule or standard of holiness. But if there are two rules essentially different in the two dispensations, then the holiness attained by the two rules must be essentially different, as it is impossible to arrive at the same point by going in different directions. Thus it is shown that a change of the moral law of God involves a change of the divine perfections, which is a manifest absurdity.

The testimony given to show that God's holy covenant of ten commandments reaches into the New Testament, we consider perfectly conclusive; while there is not the least evidence to show that Christ, in his teachings, referred to any other law than that spoken of by David, Solomon, and the Prophets; nor that the apostles referred to any other (moral) law than that spoken of by the Saviour in Matt. v, and other places. As no line of distinction is drawn by any of them, it is evident that no distinction exists. It is spoken of in the same terms, as possessed of the same nature, its observance securing the same blessings, its violation attended with the same fatal consequences. Christ, in his teachings, never referred to any law to be developed in the future, but always spoke of one as then existing. In Matt. v, 17, he says that he came not to destroy the law or the Prophets. The minds of the people who heard this sermon, [Chap. vii, 28,] must have reverted to the law written in their scriptures, as readily as to the

Prophets in the same; and the more so as he quotes from the Decalogue, and declares that he who breaks the least of these commandments, shall be least in the kingdom of heaven. (Not the Jewish church or dispensation.)

Some stress has been laid on the word *fulfill*, as though in fulfilling the law he abolished, or did it away. But he said he came not to destroy it, and I am unable to discover any difference between abolishing a law and destroying it. When a law is abolished what further can be done to destroy it? Then it is supposed, or at least argued, that we are not under obligation to observe any part of the law that has not been plainly re-enacted since the crucifixion. We have already shown how fatal that would be to other moral precepts besides the fourth commandment. In Matt. vii, 12, the Saviour testifies to the perfect agreement between the law and the gospel; and, also, in chap. xxii, 37-40, he shows that they are the same in essence—resting on the same fundamental principles. In chap. v, 17, he speaks of the law and the Prophets in the same manner: "Think not that I am come to destroy the law or the Prophets: I am not come to destroy, but to fulfill." Then the same conclusion should be drawn in reference to the law and the Prophets; if the law is abolished, so also are the Prophets; and we should no longer quote from the prophecies of the Old Testament, or only so far as they are re-established, in plain terms in the New Testament. But this, our no-law friends will not agree to: they quote as readily from the Old Testament to sustain their theories, as any other class. But the scriptures do not justify the conclusion that in fulfilling the law, he did it away

abolished, or made it void; and those who urge an objection on the word fulfill, change the issue when they come to other passages. Thus, when James speaks of the "royal law," they deny that it means the Decalogue, but the simple declaration, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." Then to bring their two positions together it would read thus: "If ye *abolish* the royal law according to the scriptures 'Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself, ye do well.'" See also Matt. iii, 15; Gal. vi, 2; Rom. xiii, 8-10. By an examination of the above scriptures, it will be seen, that any argument that would prove that Christ abolished the law, and releases us from the obligation to keep it, by fulfilling it, would prove a total release from all moral obligation, and that by our own action, independent of the assistance of the Saviour to abolish moral principles for us!

The words of our Saviour recorded in Matt. xxii, 37-40, are often quoted to prove that he discarded the old law of ten precepts or commandments, and substituted a new one of two precepts; but on examination it will be found that his words plainly prove the contrary. Instead of bringing in any new law or principles, he quotes Deut. vi, 5, and Lev. xix, 18, and says, *On these hang all the law.* He does not say, in this dispensation *these are all the law*; but that *all* the law depends on them. [Whiting, Campbell.] Then *all* the law must, of course, be something more than these. Our opponents will doubtless admit that the first three, and last six commandments in the Decalogue naturally depend on these two principles. If a man says he loves his poor neighbor, and will yet see him suffer cold or hunger, without giving him of his abundance the things that his neighbor needs,

we can have no confidence in his profession;—if he loved him he would minister to his necessities; [Jas. ii, 14-16;] and if *any one* of these six precepts is violated, it shows a want of love to our fellow-men; as these commandments grow out of our relation to one another. So it will be acknowledged that if any man breaks the first three commandments, or either of them, he is wanting in love to God, as they depend on this principle. But when the first three are fully observed, the principle of love to God is not yet fulfilled, as developed by the words of the Saviour above quoted. He says not that *three-fourths*, or *nine-tenths* of the law depend on those two great commandments, but *all* the law; and no one can deny that the Sabbath commandment is in the law. Hence, the Sabbath depends on those principles as surely as any other moral precept. And as the observance of the last six manifests our love to our fellow-creatures, growing out of our relation to one another, so the observance of the first four, shows our love to God, because they all grow out of our relation to him, as our Creator, and Supreme Moral Governor; and no one can show that the principle of this first great commandment would not be violated by polluting the Lord's holy Sabbath, as much as by profaning his holy name.

As we find no reason to suppose that the Saviour referred to any other law than the one acknowledged at the time of his coming, we will pass on to consider the writings of the Apostles on this subject. Paul to the Romans and Galatians speaks much of *the law*; and we must ascertain whether he brings in a new law, or refers, as did the Saviour, to the one previously existing. It is confidently asserted by

some, that the argument of Paul to the Romans, especially chapters ii, iii, is respecting the law of circumcision, and written only to the Jews; and that the law established, is the "law of faith" in Christ. If the law established was the law of faith, would not the question in chap. iii, 31, be superfluous? Do we then make void the law of faith through faith? But if the *commandments of God* are established by the *faith of Jesus*, then the words of the Apostle are pertinent. That the Apostle addresses the Jew particularly in some places, we admit, but that the epistle was not written for the Jews exclusively is evident from the very commencement. He expresses his desire to come to them that he might have fruit among them also, "even as among other Gentiles," and says, The gospel is the power of God through faith unto salvation—to the Jew first, and also to the Greek. Chap. i, 13, 16. In this same chapter he gives a catalogue of crimes which have generally been placed to the account of the heathen world, but Paul adds, "Thou art inexcusable, *O man, whosoever thou art*, that judgest; for wherein thou judgest another, thou condemnest thyself; for thou that judgest, doest the same things." Chap. ii, 1. In chap. iii, 9, he says that he has before proved both Jews and Gentiles, that *they are all under sin*; evidently referring to chap. ii, 1, as above. He further says that God will render to *every man* according to his deeds—to the Jew first and also to the Gentile; for there is no respect of persons with God. Chap. ii, 6, 10, 11. Thus the question of national difference or preference is settled; yet we wish to have it borne in mind that Paul acknowledges two classes, Jew and Gentile, and brings them both up

for examination in this scripture. He then says that as many as have *sinned without law* shall also perish *without law*, and as many as have sinned in the law shall be judged by the law, in the day when God shall judge the secrets of men. Verses 12, 16. We must here bear in mind that the authorized definition of sin, is, "the transgression of the law." 1 John iii, 4. Then what does the Apostle mean by the words, *sinned without law*? for he also affirms that "where no law is, there is no transgression." Rom. iv, 15. According to these plain declarations, in the entire absence of law, there can be no sin. And if sinning without law and perishing without law, be in the entire absence of law, it will conflict with another declaration, that, "Sin is not imputed where there is no law." Chap. v, 13. Verses 13–15, of chap. ii, are parenthetical and explanatory of verse 12, by which the meaning of this apparently obscure passage is made clear. We will still bear in mind that Paul is speaking of two classes—Jews and Gentiles. The Jews heard the law; but this gave them no pre-eminence; (except in privilege, chap. iii, 1, 2;) as the *hearers* of the law are not just before God, but the *doers* of the law shall be justified. ✕ James says we should be doers of the word, and not hearers only, as the hearers may be forgetful; "but whoso looketh into the perfect law of liberty, and *continueth* therein, he being not a forgetful hearer, but a doer of the work, this man shall be blessed in his deed," or doing, margin. Jas. i, 22–25. ✕ We have shown from the scriptures that the knowledge of God's law was general upon the earth before it was spoken to Israel from Sinai. The Hebrews had as little chance to know it as any peo-

ple on earth. Ex. iii, 7; iv, 23. The Gentiles did not hear it spoken from Mount Sinai; but had a previous knowledge of its requirements—had the work of the law written upon their hearts; this is further manifest in that they might do the things contained in the law; and their consciences must be enlightened by it, in order to bear witness to the propriety or impropriety of their actions, and thus they were enabled to accuse or excuse one another, as the case might be. In verse 17, he addresses the Jew thus: "Behold thou art called a Jew, and retest in the law, and makest thy boast of God, and knowest his will, and approvest the things that are more excellent, being instructed out of the law." If any doubt remains as to what law is spoken of in this epistle, the doers of which would be justified, here it must be settled; it is the law that the Jew was instructed out of, and rested in; by which he also knew God's will; the law that teaches that a man should not steal; [verse 21;] that says that a man should not commit adultery; [verse 22;] that led to an abhorrence of idols; the transgression of which dishonors God, [verse 23,] and was an occasion for the Gentiles to blaspheme his name. Verse 24. 2 Sam. xii, 14.

There are two expressions in the foregoing verses, which we wish to notice more particularly. The Jew, who was instructed out of the law, is said to know the will of God. The Saviour uses the same words in John vii, 16, 17: "My doctrine is not mine, but his that sent me." If any man will do his will he shall know of the doctrine whether it be of God, or whether I speak of myself." Here Jesus gave them a test whereby they might discern the truth-

fulness of his doctrine, and know that it was of God; and it is not every one that says to Jesus, "Lord, Lord," that shall enter into the kingdom of heaven, but they who do the will of the Father in heaven. But in order to *do* the will of God, it must be expressed in such a manner that it can be done or performed. The mere declaration of a fact, however true, cannot be done—the expression of his will to be done must contain a rule of action, a law. Hence, if any man do the law of God, he will be competent to judge of the doctrine of the gospel of Christ, whether it be of God. The law embracing "the whole duty of man," is a perfect expression of his will; and as the doctrine of Christ is of God, there is a complete harmony between them. Man was under condemnation for the transgression of God's law—God was in Christ reconciling the world to himself—to save them from their sins; [Matt. i, 21;] hence there must be a perfect agreement between the Father and the Son—the will of God and the doctrine of Christ—the law and the gospel. This agreement is so perfect, so beautifully harmonious, that he that keeps the law of the Father, knows the doctrine of the Son; and in the day of his coming they shall know that he is in the Father, and they in him, and he in them. John xiv, 3, 20. O glorious time! Hasten the day, dear Saviour, when the kingdom of our God shall come, and his "will be done" on earth as it is done in heaven.

Again, Paul asks, "Thou who makest thy boast of the law, through breaking the law, dishonorest thou God?" This was the great offense of the Jews. When the nations of the earth were given to wickedness, God confirmed his law to Israel for an ever-

lasting covenant. 1 Chron. xvi, 17. The transgression of this law, as the Apostle declares, dishonors God. The word of the Lord by Malachi, says: "A son honoreth his father, and a servant his master: if then I be a father, where is mine honor? and if I be a master, where is my fear? saith the Lord of hosts, unto you, O priests, that despise my name." Chap. i, 6. This reproof of the priests continues in chap. ii, where it is said, The priests' lips should keep knowledge, and they should seek the law at his mouth. Verse 7. But ye are departed out of the way; ye have caused many to stumble at the law. Verse 8. Thus they dishonor God by transgressing the law; though they made their boast of him, and professed to honor him as their father. See John viii, 38-44.

But it is claimed that the "law of circumcision" is spoken of in the latter part of the second chapter of Romans and throughout the third. Now I do not know of any such law as "the law of circumcision." I read that God made a covenant with Abraham, and gave him circumcision as a token, seal, or earnest of that covenant. Gen. xvii, 11; Rom. iv, 11; Eph. i, 13, 14. The seal of the covenant is distinct from the covenant itself, as the seal of a bond is neither the bond itself, nor the condition of the bond. Circumcision was given as a sign or seal of righteousness—the righteousness, of course, existing prior to the giving of the rite. Rom. iv, 11. So that circumcision, or the sign of righteousness, is of avail, only where the righteousness exists; therefore Paul says, [Rom. ii, 25,] "circumcision verily profiteth if thou keep the law," i. e., the seal is valid where the righteousness exists; "but if thou be a breaker of the

law, thy circumcision is made uncircumcision;" i. e., if the righteousness is wanting, the seal or sign thereof is of no consequence, because it signifies nothing. Consequently the uncircumcision by nature, or Gentiles, if they fulfill the law, shall judge those who by letter and circumcision transgress the law. Verse 27. Hence circumcision is of no consequence only as it is connected with the observance of the law; as is said in 1 Cor. vii, 19, "Circumcision is nothing, and uncircumcision is nothing, but the keeping of the commandments of God." In these passages there is a very plain distinction between *circumcision* and *the law*. He further declares that the distinctions of Jew and circumcision, in the sense they were formerly considered, are at an end. Circumcision is the operation of the Spirit of God on the heart; [Rom. iv, 11; Eph. i, 13; iv, 30; 2 Cor. i 22; Col. ii, 11;] and those whose hearts are thus operated upon are Jews inwardly. Matt. iii, 9; John viii, 37-44; Rev. iii, 9.

The question which follows in Rom. iii, 1, would naturally arise after such declarations, "what advantage then hath the Jew?" And the answer is in no way contradictory to the minds of those who have noticed the privileges conferred on them as a people. Please examine Deut. iv, 7, 8; Ps. cxlvii, 19, 20; Rom. ix, 4. The chief advantage or privilege, being this: that to them were committed the oracles of God. This advantage certainly could not consist in receiving something of no value, but the "lively oracles to give unto us." Acts vii, 38. For what if some did not believe? Will not their unbelief destroy the faithfulness of God? By no means. God's word is sure, if men have not believed; for if

their unbelief made the faithfulness of God without effect, he would not be justified in threatening, and clear in judgment. Macknight, verses 3, 4. See Ps. li, 4. Here the justice of God's threatening and judgment is made dependent upon the perpetuity of these oracles given to the Jews.

But some seem to suppose that transgression, or sin, is necessary to the development of God's grace; and because the manifestation of his grace redounds to his glory, our sin, transgression, or unrighteousness, (for all unrighteousness is sin,) will commend his righteousness. God would of course be unrighteous in taking vengeance on the very act which glorifies him. And if this be so, "*How then shall God judge the world?*" (Not the Jews alone.) If my lie more fully develops his truth, making it abound to his glory, why am I counted a sinner? [see 1 Cor. vi, 20;] and why not add, "Let us do evil that good may come?" To make the meaning still more plain let us use a familiar illustration: A parent has told his child that all unrighteousness is sin, and sin is the transgression of the law; and has given him (the son) certain laws. The father ascertains that his son has transgressed one of his commands, and calls him to an account for his sin; but being full of love and compassion for his son, he says: "My son, for this transgression of law, or unrighteousness you deserve to be punished; but I have no pleasure in your pain, and would rather you would cease from sin, and be free from punishment; therefore, I forgive you this sin, if you will act in conformity to my will in the future. [See Eph. ii, 4-8; Rom. vi, 23; Eze. xxxiii, 11; Acts v, 31; Matt. iii, 8.] Soon after this, the father finds that

his son has been guilty of committing other sins; and on being again called to an account, he justifies himself thus:—"When I first transgressed your laws, your mercy was manifested in the forgiveness of my sin, or transgression; and your love and mercy were never so strikingly manifested as then. Now in order more fully to develop those noble traits of character, and give room for richer displays of your grace, I have committed other sins. But you will not be justified in judging me, as my unrighteousness commends your righteousness, and my disobedience gives room for a display of your love and mercy. You said you were slow to anger and plenteous in mercy; [Jonah iv, 2; Joel ii, 13; Ps. lxxxvi, 5;] and if you pass by my sin, my lie will cause your truth to abound to your glory; suffer me, therefore to do evil that good may come. Further, I enjoyed your favor, or grace, which abounded over my first transgression; now, I fear if I keep your commandments, I shall fall from grace; therefore I must continue in transgression, or sin, that your grace may abound!" Would this reasoning satisfy the parent who knew that his law was founded in justice, and that those only were deserving his love who kept it? [Ex. xx, 6;] yet this is the method of reasoning adopted by those who strive to make void the law through faith; but Paul says their damnation is just. Here we would ask the objector to examine the following points:—1. What law does Paul speak of in Rom. ii, 13, the doers of which shall be justified? Lev. xviii, 5; Deut. vi, 25; x, 12, 13; Eccl. xii, 13, 14; Eze. xx, 11, 12; Matt. v, 19; xix, 16, 17. 2. Does he not continue to speak of the same law in verses 17-25, and chap. iii? 3. If circumcision were prof-

itable to the law-keeper, and otherwise counted for uncircumcision, were not the oracles of Rom. iii, 2, and Acts vii, 38, the precepts of the same law by which the Jews had advantage, and circumcision profit? 4. Does not Paul clearly show that God will *judge the world* by these oracles, without respect to persons, or national distinctions?

By doing this law, which the Jews had directly committed to them, they would have been justified; but having heard it, they broke it, and thereby put themselves on a level with the Gentiles: all being under sin. Rom. iii, 9. The scripture is quoted in verses 9-19, to prove that no one has kept the law; and the law speaks to them that are under the law, that every mouth may be stopped, and all the world become subject to the judgment of God. (Margin.) From this it is clear that all are under the law; because all have sinned. Even as Christ was made under the law, [Gal. iv, 4,] by being made sin for us; [2 Cor. v, 21,] having our iniquities laid on him. Is. liii, 6. And for the reason that all have sinned, no flesh shall be justified by the deeds of the law. Rom. iii, 20. Mark well this point. There is no contradiction between this declaration, and Chap. ii, 13; where it is said, "The doers of the law shall be justified;" as he here shows that none shall be justified by it, because there are no doers of it. So now, instead of being justified by it, they are condemned by it; for by the law is the knowledge of sin. No conduct can be proved sinful, except by the law. The theories of some men lead them to a conclusion different from that drawn by the Apostle; but we would inquire, Does the law condemn an innocent man? if not he must be justified by it; as justifica-

tion and condemnation stand as opposites, and there is no intermediate state between them.

Now, inasmuch as all are under condemnation, none can be justified by the law: if any are saved, or justified, it must be by the manifestation of God's righteousness, independent of our obedience, or without the law; we having forfeited everything by our transgression. This righteousness is witnessed by the law and the Prophets; [Matt. vii, 12; Gal. iii, 24; Acts x, 43,] and is by faith of Jesus Christ unto all, and upon all, that believe; for there is no difference; for all have sinned. Justification comes freely (and only) by his grace, through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus, whom God hath set forth to manifest his grace, by his own forbearance, forgiving our sins. It is by faith in his blood that we have redemption; [verse 24; Eph. i, 7; Col. i, 14; 1 Pet. i, 18, 19; Rev. v, 9,] for the wages of sin is death; [Rom. vi, 23,] and the life is (in) the blood; [Gen. ix, 4; Lev. xvii, 11, 14; Deut. xii, 23,] therefore the blood is given to make an atonement; [Lev. xvii, 11,] and without shedding of blood is no remission. Heb. ix, 22. Then Christ died for our sins; [1 Cor. xv, 3,] and his blood cleanseth us from all sin; [1 John i, 7,] and for this cause he is the mediator of the New Testament, that by means of death, for the redemption of the transgressions under the first testament, they which are called might receive the promise of eternal inheritance. Heb. ix, 15. Then the death of the sinner is certain; because the law condemns him, he not being a partaker of God's righteousness through faith in the blood of Christ; and the death of Christ was absolutely necessary to our salvation, according to the above

scriptures; that God might be just, and the justifier of him that believeth in Jesus. Verse 26. What is necessary that God may be just? Justice demands the enforcement or maintenance of just laws, or principles. In order to the observance of such principles on the part of the agent, the law or rule of action by which he is to be governed, must, of course, be just; then to fully meet the demands of justice, the sanctions or penalties of such law must be rigidly enforced. The judge would not be just, who would let the condemned criminal escape; and the justice of God would not be approved, should he pass lightly by the transgression of his law, placing no difference between the righteous and the wicked. Gen. xviii, 25. The righteousness of God by faith of Jesus Christ is declared that he may be just, or maintain the principles of justice, and yet justify those who believe in Jesus, though they had transgressed these principles, or laws. The next inquiry is, What are the principles which God must maintain in order to vindicate his justice. Of course they must be the precepts of the law which the sinner has transgressed: otherwise he might be just, though he did not punish the transgressor. Now if God has ever given a law by which moral agents were to develop their characters, and has changed, modified, or relaxed the law in any particular, to accommodate it to the circumstances of the transgressor, his justice would be relaxed in the same degree; and after such relaxation, the justice of God's government could not be viewed in the same light by intelligent moral beings that it would, had he strictly maintained the pure principles of his government.

The respect for law decreases in proportion to the possibility of the sinner to escape its penalties.

Again, the principles to be maintained by God in order to his being just, must be the same that man would be justified in observing. Then if man would be justified, or stand uncondemned before God, by doing the law, it is manifest that the law itself contains the principles of justification. This is what God must maintain to be just; and we have already shown how he can justify those who have faith in the blood of Christ, while he vindicates his holy law by letting its penalty fall on the Saviour. Salvation thus given excludes boasting, and brings, Jew and Gentile on the same level; and thus, instead of making void the law of God through faith in Jesus Christ, it is *established*, maintained and vindicated by the death of Christ for its transgression. Verse 31. This holy law has so long been despised and rejected of men, that some of its friends and advocates have so far given way to popular prejudice and early education, as to suppose that the doers of the law would not be justified by doing the law, but by faith in Christ;* but we trust that all those who have followed us thus far in the examination of the nature of the law, will see that it is fully sufficient to justify and protect the observer of it: if it is not, it is weak and unprofitable indeed, and the righteous might well say, "It is vain to serve God: and what profit is it that we have kept his ordinances?" Mal. iii. 14. "O that there were such an heart in

*By this we would not be understood as teaching that any one, since the fall of Adam, can do the law, unaided by faith in Christ.

them, that they would fear me, and keep my commandments always, that it might be well with them and with their children forever!" Deut. v, 29. But if any are yet disposed to deny the justifying nature of the law, we would inquire of them, If man had never broken the law, would he have needed a Saviour? Or, if Christ had broken the law, could he have been a Saviour? A little examination must satisfy all on this point.

Abraham was justified by faith, [Rom. iv,] his faith being made perfect by his works; [Jas. ii, 22,] and though he were justified by works, he could only glory before men and not before God; as he would have been, even then, an unprofitable servant. Luke xvii, 10; Job xxii, 3; xxxv, 7, 8. He was justified by the faith that he had before he was circumcised, that he might be the father of the faithful, though they be uncircumcised; for all the blessings of the covenant rested on God's promise, and not on the law; for if they had rested on the law, the promise would be of no effect, as all had transgressed the law; then faith would have been void. Verse 14. By the law is the knowledge of sin; and all have sinned. Hence the law, instead of securing blessings, worketh wrath. Verse 15. But now being justified by faith, [Chap. v, 11,] we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ; for we have been at enmity with him by wicked works; [Chap. viii, 7; Col i, 21,] with neither disposition nor means to be reconciled to him; this he effected by the death of his Son. Rom. v, 9, 10. The idea previously considered is shown in verse 13 and onward: For until the law, sin was in the world; but sin is the transgression of the law; therefore before

the law was given on Mount Sinai, the principles of the law were known and transgressed. For death entered by sin, and those who lived from Adam to Moses were judged as sinners, but sin is not imputed *when* there is no law. These verses clearly prove our position, that the phrases, *the hearing of the law*, and the *entering* of the law, and "*until the law*," refer to the giving of the law on Mount Sinai. In verses 20, 21, the offense (sin) existed before the law was given, and the law entered that sin or transgression might abound, as sin is known by the law; [Chap. iii, 20,] but where sin abounded, grace through Christ much more abounded. Sin reigned, or triumphed, unto death; but grace has triumphed over sin unto eternal life, *through righteousness*. Now all unrighteousness is sin, or transgression [1 John v, 17,] and righteousness must be the opposite—obedience. Hence grace is triumphant, bringing eternal life through obedience.

Some might suppose that obedience to the law was only required of Christ, and not of us, because it is said, [Rom. v, 19,] "By the obedience of one shall many be made righteous." But if the conclusion which we have drawn from the above scriptures is correct, to wit, that righteousness and obedience are synonymous, then the meaning is this: "By the obedience of one shall many be made obedient;" and this is in accordance with the whole tenor of the sacred writings. God gave a perfect law—obedience to it was man's whole duty, and he would have lived, had he done it. But he transgressed it, and was thereby brought under condemnation. God loved him even in his sinful state, and sent his Son to die in man's stead. The death of his Son was necessa-

ry, because his law was holy, just and good, and must be maintained. Would it not be reasonable to suppose, that, in the death of his Son, God desired rather to bring the transgressor back to obedience to his law, than to release him from further obligation to keep it? If the nature of the law remained unchanged, as it must, being perfect, a rule of holiness, containing justifying principles, then the transgression of it must still be wrong, or sinful, and of course still tending to condemnation; and if through the death of Christ we are released from the obligation to keep this holy law, then Christ becomes the minister of sin. Gal. ii, 17. If it had not been a law of purely moral principles, the doers of it never could have been justified; as its observance could not have served to the development of a pure, moral character. As a character cannot be developed without a law, so the character developed must be the exact counterpart of the law performed. If a law, or rule of action, is iniquitous and unjust in its nature, requiring unjust actions, then the person keeping it will also be unjust; but if the law is moral, holy, just and good, then the observance of it will develop a moral, holy, just, or pure character. We have seen that God always required holiness as the ground of acceptance with him; hence the law that he gave by which man was to form his character, must have been moral and holy in its nature. But moral, holy principles cannot change, neither can they be relaxed nor abolished, and God their author still be just. And if Christ justifies the transgressor in his transgression, he would become accessory to the transgression of a just and holy law, and thus grace would reign through unrighteousness. But all unrighteousness is sin; and

the wages of sin is death; hence it is impossible that grace should reign through unrighteousness unto eternal life. Therefore we conclude that faith in Christ does not make void the law, but establishes it, and strengthens, if possible, the obligation resting on us to keep it.

The Apostle, in Rom. vi, anticipates the objection of those who would make void the law through faith—make Christ the minister of sin—and sin that grace may abound—professing to commend God's righteousness through Christ by their own unrighteousness, or sin. He says we shall not continue transgressing the law that grace may abound; for if we are in Christ, we are dead to sin; if dead to it, we cannot live in it, as death and life are opposites. Here we must proceed in our examination with great caution, as many have misconstrued or perverted the language of the Apostle in Chaps. vi and vii. First, we must ascertain what is meant by being dead to sin. It is clearly shown in Chaps. ii and iii, that all the world, both Jew and Gentile, are under the law because all have sinned, or transgressed the law. Thus also Christ was made under the law, because he was made sin for us. He took our condition, was made sin for us, that he might occupy our position, be under the law, that he might redeem them that were under the law, that they might be made the righteousness of God in him. 2 Cor. v, 21; Gal. iv, 4, 5. Perhaps no scripture can be found more strongly expressive of the perpetuity and justice of the law, than that which shows that after the Saviour died to meet the demands of the law for us, we must reckon ourselves dead with Christ, and are held under the law, as being condemned by it, until

we die with him. But if on the other hand, our opponents have the truth, viz., that the law is dead, then we have presented to us the singular anomaly of a living man being held under the dominion of a dead law! If Christ had abolished the law at his death, or if we could make it void through faith in Christ, then we should certainly be freed from it, without dying to it. All are under sin, and the wages of sin is death; [Rom. vi, 23;] and for this reason, that the law demands the life of the transgressor, the law hath dominion over a man, or he is under the law, so long as he liveth. Chap. vii, 1. The endeavor has been made to use the illustration presented in this chapter to teach an opposite doctrine. The woman is bound by the law to her husband so long as he liveth; but if the husband be dead, she is free from the law of her husband, and may be married to another. Then as we are married to Christ, as is taught in verse 4, some argue that we are represented by the woman, the law being represented by the husband that is dead. But this is a very unjust conclusion. The illustration plainly teaches that death is necessary to change the woman's relation to the law, while no change in the condition of the law is intimated. But the Apostle draws his own conclusion; he says: "Ye are become dead to the law by the body of Christ;" and in verse 1, before he brings in the illustration, he says, "the law hath dominion over a man so long as *he* liveth." The whole tenor of his argument in both these chapters proves it; and in the margin of verse 6, it reads, "being dead to that wherein we were held;" [Whiting's translation;] "being dead to that by which we were held." [Macknight, verse 4.] "Ye have been

put to death by the law;" [verse 6;] "having died in that by which we were tied;" [Campbell and Doddridge;] "having died with Christ, we are released from the law." If we are dead to the law, we are no longer under the law: we are free from its curse; and to us there is no condemnation. Our sins are borne away by Christ, who died for them; we die with him to have them removed from us; in this manner being free from, or dead to them; and if dead to sin, we cannot live in it; [Chap. vi, 2;] and that we are dead to sin we have manifested by being baptized into the death of Christ. Verse 3. As we have died with him, so we have been buried with him by baptism into death; [verse 4;] and as he was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, so we emerge from the watery grave to live another, or a new life. For if we have been planted together in the likeness of his death, we shall be also in the likeness of his resurrection. Verse 5. *If* implies, or introduces a condition. In order to the enjoyment of the promised blessings, we must comply with the condition on which it is based. In order to be in the likeness of his resurrection, for which Paul labored, as well as the ancient worthies; [Phil. iii, 10; Heb. xi, 35;] we must be planted or buried by baptism in the likeness of his death. There is a resurrection not unto life; [John v, 29; Rev. xx, 6;] therefore we must labor to secure, not merely a resurrection, but a "better resurrection," even the "likeness" of Christ's resurrection. So the condition is not merely "being buried," but "being buried with him by baptism into death"—"planted in the likeness of his death;" and the order as given in the scripture, is this: [1 Cor. xv, 3, 4:] Christ first died

for our sins, next was buried, and then rose again. In like manner, or in this likeness, we must first die to the law, then be buried by baptism, and then rise to walk in newness of life. How can this be done by those who deny the obligation to keep the law under this dispensation; who say the law is dead, and that they do not die to it? If the law is dead they cannot be held by it; and if they are not held by it, they do not die to it. But if they do not die to it, they cannot be buried by baptism into death, but must, if baptized, be buried alive, or without dying. Hence, they cannot walk in newness of life, or in a new life, but must be living the same old life they formerly lived—under sin. But he that is dead is free from sin. Verse 7. As Christ died for sin once, but now lives to God, so we must be dead to sin, but alive to God through Christ. If we have been freed from the service of sin, or transgression, we should not let it reign in our mortal bodies, or triumph over us, to cause us to serve it in lust. Verse 13. Neither suffer our members to be used as instruments in the service of sin, but yield ourselves to God, and our members as instruments in the cause of righteousness, or right doing. Then we shall be free from sin, it having no more dominion over us, because we have died to it, Christ having redeemed us from the curse of the law, and placed us under grace.

But when are we placed under grace? Evidently, when we are brought from under the law, and that cannot take place until we die to it, seeing the law has dominion over us as long as we live. All, of every dispensation, must be in one or the other of these two conditions:—condemned or justified:—un-

der the law or under grace. But if Christ abolished, did away, the law eighteen centuries ago, then none can be under the law, but all must be under grace, and "our preaching is vain," there being no necessity of a new life, since all the world, for the last eighteen hundred years have been under grace! Now the Apostle has clearly shown that all are under the law by transgression, and must so remain till they die with Christ—have the body of transgression crucified with him, and then walk in a new life—no longer serve sin, or transgress the law. An objection is strongly urged from this expression in verse 14. Because we are not under the law, it is thought we are not to keep the law: but what law should we not keep? The objector says, the ten commandments. If it does not mean the ten commandments then there is not even the appearance of an objection left. But verses 13–15, directly contradict the idea that we may sin—transgress the law—because we are not under the law. We will paraphrase a few verses, considering that this law is the ten commandments, and sin is the transgression of the law. Verses 14–18. For the transgression of the ten commandments shall not have dominion over you, for you are not under the ten commandments but under grace, What then? Shall we transgress the ten commandments because we are not under the ten commandments but under grace? God forbid. Know ye not that to whom ye yield yourselves servants to obey, his servants ye are to whom ye obey; whether of the transgression of the ten commandments unto death, or of obedience unto righteousness? But God be thanked, that though ye were the servants of the transgression of the ten commandments, ye have obeyed from the

heart that form of doctrine whereunto ye were delivered. [Margin.] Being then made free from the transgression of the ten commandments, ye became the servants of righteousness, or right doing, the opposite of transgression. Here it is plainly declared that after we are brought from under the law and placed under grace, if we sin, or transgress the law, we are again brought under the law; but by abstaining from sin, we continue under grace. And that no change has taken place in the law is evident, inasmuch as the transgression of it still brings death to the transgressor, "for the wages of sin is death;" not *was* death.

We will further notice the illustration of Chap. vii. "If while her husband liveth, she be married to another man, she shall be called an adulteress; but if her husband be dead she is free from that law, so that she is no adulteress though she be married to another man." Verse 3. The application is made thus: "Wherefore my brethren, ye also are become dead to the law by the body of Christ, *that ye should be married to another*, even to him that is raised from the dead." In the illustration the woman was proved by the law to be an adulteress, if she married another before death changed her relation to the law. Of course the law could not die, as she could neither be "accused" nor "excused," without the law; "for by the law is the knowledge of sin." And so in the application: if we have not died to the law, we have no power to be married to him who was raised from the dead; and if we profess to be joined to Christ without dying to the law, according to the application of the Apostle, we occupy the same position before the law, as an adulterous woman. In view of

these plain scripture facts, we inquire, What is the duty of those who have been trampling on God's holy covenant? We see that in order that they may be joined to Christ, they must die to the law, and if they have died to it, they should be buried with him by baptism into death, that they may arise and walk in newness of life. But some excuse themselves because they have previously been professed followers of Christ, and transgressed the commandment ignorantly. In order to understand their duty, it is necessary to know how God regards sins of ignorance. Presumptuous sins are worthy of, and to be punished with, death; [Ex. xxi, 14; Num. xv, 30, 31; Deut. xvii, 12; Heb. x, 26, 57;] while sins of ignorance are to be atoned for. Lev. iv, 13-35; Num. xv, 22-29. Paul says he obtained mercy because he sinned ignorantly, in unbelief. 1 Tim. i, 13. The law of God showed him his sinful condition. Rom. vii, 7. He was alive without the law, sin being dead, or having no strength; [1 Cor. xv, 56;] but when the commandment came, imparting the knowledge of, and thereby giving strength to, sin, he saw that he was a transgressor of the law, and stood condemned—under the law. He then died to the law with Christ. Being dead, he was buried by baptism into death—the first time that such an event could possibly take place—and then arose to walk in newness of life: and instead of continuing in the service of sin, the law of God became his delight. Rom. vii, 22. Hitherto he had lived a Pharisee, and although zealous toward God, [Acts xxii, 5,] he was ignorant of God's righteousness. Rom. x, 23; iii, 21, 22. But now, instead of making a formal, self-righteous profession of love to God, he served in new-

ness of spirit, being led by the Spirit of God. To those who walk thus, there is no condemnation—the righteousness of the law is fulfilled in them—the enmity to God is slain—the carnal mind removed, and all brought into subjection to God's law, which they now confess is holy, just, and good.

Another objection is urged from Rom. x, 4:—“Christ is the end of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth.” If, because he is the end of the law, we are no longer to keep the law, the declaration only reaches those who believe. Of course those who do not believe are still under obligation to keep the law. Then this would not only prove that the law is still in force, but that those who do not believe are under obligation to observe moral precepts, which the believer in Christ is not under obligation to observe! This is the inevitable conclusion of antinomian teachings. Is it any wonder that infidelity abounds, while doctrines of such an immoral tendency are taught for Christianity? But to show that there is nothing in this text inconsistent with the teachings of the previous chapters, we copy the definition of the word here used, as given by Webster; also of the words fulfill, destroy and abolish:—

END, *n.* Extreme point; ultimate object; design; cessation; death.

FULFILL, *v. t.* To perform; to complete; to accomplish.

DESTROY, *v. t.* To kill; to annihilate; to demolish; to ruin; to lay waste.

ABOLISH, *v. t.* To destroy; to repeal; to make void.

Is Christ the end of the law in such manner that we may transgress it? The transgression of the law is sin, or unrighteousness; but it is not said that he is the end of the law for unrighteousness, but for righteousness, or obedience. We have shown from the scriptures the absurdity of supposing that the law of God is abolished or destroyed because it is fulfilled; and we would now refer to the following passages to show that *end* does not necessarily mean cessation, or death, but the ultimate object or design. Heb. xiii, 7, 8; 1 Pet. i, 9; James v, 11. “Behold we count them happy which endure. Ye have heard of the patience of Job, and have seen the end of the Lord; that the Lord is very pitiful and of tender mercy.” Now the law was ordained unto life, because it is a just standard of morals; but transgressors can obtain life only through Christ; and we understand this scripture to mean that the ultimate object or design of the law is accomplished in the person of Christ, who takes away the carnal mind, bestows upon us a moral character, and brings us to obedience.

Many have been made to stumble over the letter to the Romans, supposing that Paul's reasoning did tend to make void the law through faith. But we trust that the opposite has been shown to the satisfaction of all candid minds—that thus far God's law stands firm on the authority of the New Testament. But the question now arises, Did Paul, in writing to the Romans, contradict what he had written to the Galatians two years before? We cannot believe that he did; and as he has maintained the perpetuity of the law in his letter to the Romans, in order that the two harmonize, he must also maintain it in that to the

Galatians; and in our examination of this epistle, if we "find some things hard to be understood," let us not wrest them to our own destruction, but compare them with the other scriptures, and thus ascertain the mind of the Spirit.

We have stated our belief that the Saviour and the Apostles spoke of the same law that the Prophets wrote of, because they drew no line of distinction, but regarded it in the same light, as possessed of the same nature, its observance securing the same great reward, and its transgression attended with the same fatal consequences. For the same reason we conclude that the same law is spoken of in Galatians and Romans; that the word *law*, whenever it is used in the epistle of James, or those to the Galatians and Romans, has reference to the moral law of God, the ten commandments, except when directly qualified, as in Rom. vii, 23, 25; viii, 2; and Gal. vi, 2. But the same term in Hebrews always has reference to the Levitical law; the precepts of the moral code being spoken of in the plural, "laws." Heb. viii, 10. That this word [law] is used in reference to more than one law in the New Testament, we have briefly noticed; and an examination of the nature and objects of these two laws must convince all that they cannot be regarded as one and the same, and are never confounded in the sacred writings. As we have dwelt somewhat at length upon the nature of the moral law, we will consider in contrast the nature of the ceremonial or Levitical law.

A moral precept cannot possibly be typical; but is of itself holy, just and good. But the Levitical law was typical. It was a system of types and shadows. The priests under it served unto the example and

shadow of heavenly things. Its offerings were remembrances of sin. Heb. x, 3. The priesthood was instituted that offerings might be made to God through them; and the offerings were made to atone for sin. When an individual brought his offering to the priest, it was an acknowledgment on his part that he had sinned; the victim was slain to signify that he, as a sinner, was worthy of death. Thus it is evident that the whole system was instituted to show the nature and desert of sin, and the method of making an atonement for it. But if no sin existed, no offering would be required; therefore the sin laid back of, or existed before, the offering. But sin is the transgression of the law; hence the law was transgressed before any system of offerings was required; and the Levitical law was instituted because the pre-existing moral law was transgressed. A priest serves as a mediator; but if man were already justified before God, he would require no mediator. Had man kept the law he would have been justified—he would not have had sin, and of course there would have been no necessity for a sin-offering. Here the ministration of the priest, and the law over which he ministers, are clearly distinct. The sin must be antecedent to the atonement for sin. The Levitical law being typical, pointed to Christ, and the death of Christ must have been determined before the types of his work could be instituted. The necessity of his death arose from man's transgression. "He died for our sins." But if there was but one law, and that containing types and shadows, then it is impossible to show what that law was given for; and if the moral law that existed previous to the death of Christ, does not exist now, how can he mediate in the new

covenant for the redemption of the transgressions under the first covenant? Heb. ix, 15.

Again, the difference between the two laws is shown in that the ceremonies of the Levitical law were not acceptable while the precepts of the moral law were disregarded. The types pointed to Christ; but Christ came to save his people *from* their sins, not *in* their sins, and to cause grace to reign through righteousness, not through unrighteousness. Therefore if those offerings had been accepted of the Lord, while the person who offered them continued to commit the crimes for which he sought forgiveness, then the Levitical law would not have "served to the example and shadow" of Christ's ministration. The Lord said, "Hear, O earth; Behold I will bring evil upon this people, even the fruit of their thoughts; because they have not hearkened unto my word, nor to my law, but rejected it. To what purpose cometh there to me incense from Sheba, and the sweet cane from a far country? Your burnt-offerings are not acceptable, nor your sacrifices sweet unto me." Jer. vi, 19, 20. If observing the law consisted in offering sacrifices, then they could not be said to have rejected the law while they made the offerings. The complaint is not that they had not brought sacrifices and offerings, but that they had not hearkened to his law, but rejected it; and for this reason their offerings were not acceptable.

That God's law was something entirely distinct from these sacrifices, is further shown in Jer. vii, 22, 23: "For I spake not unto your fathers, nor commanded them in the day that I brought them out of the land of Egypt concerning burnt-offerings or sacrifices. But this thing I commanded them, say-

ing, Obey my voice and I will be your God and you shall be my people." When they heard his voice a few days after this commandment was given, he spoke the ten commandments in the hearing of all Israel. Ex. xix, 5, 6; xx, 1-22; Deut. iv, 12, 13.

The Apostle to the Hebrews says that the law had a *shadow* of good things to come: then that law was certainly typical. Its offerings could not make perfect, because the blood offered by it could not take away sin. The law of which he here speaks had sacrifices and offerings; but the law of God, the law of moral precepts, does not speak "concerning burnt offerings or sacrifices." Thus, by comparison, we find that two different laws are spoken of in the New Testament: one which is not made void through faith in Christ, which he came not to destroy; and another which he blotted out, and nailed to his cross. One a spiritual, holy, just and good law, the doers of which would be justified, by which is the knowledge of sin, of which Paul discourses to the Romans; the other, treated of in the epistle to the Hebrews, weak and unprofitable, carnal, making nothing perfect, containing mere shadows of good things to come. By the same method of comparison, we are led to the conclusion that one and the same law is spoken of to the Romans and Galatians; and also by the fact that the declarations in Galatians cannot be made to apply to the ceremonial law.

The letter to the Galatians is supposed to have been written about two years before that to the Romans, and on that account might have claimed the first investigation; but many are ready to admit that the Apostle to the Romans reasons concerning the moral law, who will not make the same admission

respecting his letter to the Galatians; therefore we have given that our first attention, and proved, we trust, that not a single declaration has been found therein which can be referred to the ceremonial or Levitical law. We are now prepared to examine that to the Galatians, and expect that all will agree with us that this treats solely of the moral law, if an analogy can be shown between the main positions in the two epistles. Two expressions are found in Romans, [Chap. vii, 23; viii, 2,] which do not refer to the ten commandments; nor yet to the Levitical law; but the only place in Galatians where *law* is used in reference to any thing but the ten commandments, is in Chap. vi, 2: "the law of Christ." If this declaration is found to be correct, and it can be shown that the Apostle's reasoning tends to prove the perpetuity of the law of which it treats, then the epistle to the Galatians may be considered a strong hold by those who "delight in the law of God."

To whom, and under what circumstances, did the Apostle write this letter? His declaration of what he said to Peter at Antioch, some six years before, shows that they had been troubled with judaizing teachers, who did not understand that justification was obtained wholly through Christ "without the law." Rom. iii, 19-23. This is also shown in Gal. iv, 21; v, 1-4, but this does not prove that they were Jews to whom he wrote, or that Judaism was the only error with which they were in danger of being affected. It has been supposed by some that, although this was "written to the churches of Galatia," these churches were composed of Jewish converts resident in that country; but the expressions

of Paul in Chap. i, 13, 14, evidently contradicts this. He told them they had heard of his conversation in times past in "*the Jews' religion*." When speaking of himself and others of his nation, [Acts xxvi, 4, 5,] he used the phrase, "our religion." Again, in Gal. i, 14, he said, "And profited in the *Jews' religion* above many my equals in *mine own nation*, being more exceedingly zealous of the traditions of *my fathers*." This was not his method of speaking when addressing himself to the Jews. At Rome he called the chief of the Jews together, and said, "I have committed nothing against the people, or customs of *our fathers*." Acts xxviii, 17; xxvi, 5.

It has also been supposed that Gal. iv, 8-10, refers to the ceremonies of the Levitical law, and must have been written to those who had observed that law—"When ye knew not God, ye did service to them which by nature are no gods;" and in referring again to this service he says, "Ye observe days and months and times and years." The ceremonies of the Levitical law were never contrary to the knowledge of God; never observed by those who knew not God; nor was their observance indicative of a "service to them which by nature are no gods;" inasmuch as they were required in the service of the true God under the former dispensation; so that these expressions plainly prove the contrary. But of this we shall speak more at length when we come to an examination of this chapter.

It is declared in Rom. iii, 23, that all have sinned, and this declaration is based on the authority of the scriptures; and let it be remarked, that in the New Testament dispensation the Apostle quotes from the Old Testament to prove that Jews and Gentiles were

alike sinners. But this scripture could have no bearing on the point, if the Gentiles were not amenable to the law in the Old Testament. Neither would it be in point if the law which existed at the time the scripture was written had passed away before the Apostle quoted it; yet he has adduced it as the proof, and we are satisfied to rest it there, and consider them sinners on that authority. As Jews and Gentiles are all sinners, the Jew has no pre-eminence, but must come to Christ for justification the same as the Gentile. But Peter "was to be blamed," because he separated himself, and compelled the Gentiles to live as the Jews, thereby building again the distinction which had been destroyed by the manifestation of God's righteousness through faith in Christ. Rom. iii, 21-23; Eph. ii, 13, 14. The remarks respecting the law, in this chapter are parallel with those in Romans. By the works of the law shall no flesh be justified. For I through the law am dead to the law that I might live unto God. Gal. ii, 16, 19. See Rom. iii, 20; vi, 11; vii, 4, 9. It might be inferred from Gal. iii, 2-5, that he is no longer speaking of the moral law; but we must remember that justification cannot be obtained by a law, however holy and just it may be, after it is transgressed; and those who receive the Spirit, or work miracles, must necessarily do so by faith, and not by the works of the law. But this argues nothing against the law, as it does not cease to be holy because it does not justify the transgressor; on the contrary, we could have no regard for a law which had not power to hold the transgressor under condemnation. If the transgressor of a law can justly escape its penalty, then the law itself is unjust, and should

not be enforced. That which our opponents urge against the law, viz., that it holds men under the curse, is a strong argument for its justice and perpetuity.

As Abraham was justified by faith, made perfect by works, so we are the children of Abraham, if we are of faith, and do the works of Abraham: not merely believe the word, but "*walk in the steps of that faith of our father Abraham.*" Rom. iv, 12. The gospel was preached to Abraham—the promise made of a blessing to the nations, because God would justify the nations through faith. So then they which be of faith, whether they are circumcised or not, are blessed with faithful Abraham. Rom. iv, 11; Gal. iii, 7, 9. As many as are of the works of the law are under the curse. Verse 10. Does this mean, that as many as do the works of the law, or keep the law, are under the curse? Surely not. Paul says, the doers of the law shall be justified; and James says, Whoso looketh into the perfect law of liberty, and continueth therein, shall be blessed in his deed—not cursed. The law was ordained unto life, but the wages of sin, or transgression of the law, is death. It is because they have not kept it, or continued therein, that they are cursed, as the quotation in verse 10 proves:—"For it is written, Cursed is every one that continueth not in all things written in the book of the law to do them." Compare Deut xxvii, 10, 26; xxviii, 1, 2, 15; Ps. cxix, 21. That the Apostle is here speaking of the moral law, is evident, as it is a law that not only curses the transgressor, but by observing which a man would live. Verse 12. See Lev. xviii, 5; Eze. xx, 11, 21. From the curse of this law Christ has redeemed

us, being made a curse for us, that the blessing of Abraham might come on the Gentiles through Jesus Christ. Verses 13, 14. Two important points are presented in these verses: (1.) Christ has redeemed the Gentiles from the curse of this law. (2.) The curse of this law, unless removed by Christ, stands between us and the blessing of Abraham. That the work of redemption reaches the Gentiles none will deny; but that it reaches beyond the jurisdiction of this law, cannot be shown. This law holds the Gentiles under the curse, because by it is the knowledge of sin, and by it both Jews and Gentiles are proved sinners. But if the law was not given to the Gentiles, we fail to see how Christ can redeem them from its curse. Then the argument may be stated thus: The redemption of Christ reaches those only who are under the curse of the law; the law curses those only who transgress it; and those only can transgress it who are amenable to it, or to whom it was given. But it was a Jewish law, and not given to the Gentiles; therefore the redemption of Christ does not reach the Gentiles!!

We have seen what it was to obey the voice of God, and what he commanded when his voice was heard. Deut. xxvii, 10. Moses said, "Thou shalt therefore obey the voice of the Lord thy God, and do his commandments and his statutes;" and in verse 26, it is said, "Cursed be he that confirmeth not all the words of this law to do them." Paul certainly refers to the same law, inasmuch as he quotes this scripture, and applies it to the Gentiles. But if any yet deny that this is spoken in reference to the moral law, or affirm that the Apostle includes the whole system of law under the former dispensation,

it will be time to answer them further when they show what connection the Gentile nations had with the Levitical law, or what was its curse, and how they were brought under it.

But God has promised that in Abraham and in his seed all the nations of the earth should be blessed. Gen. xxii, 18. Christ is the seed referred to in the promise; [Gal. iii, 16;] and he redeems the nations from the curse of the law in order to fulfill the promise, or that the blessing of Abraham may be conferred on them. Some have contended that the law itself is a curse, standing between us and the blessing of Abraham; but this view is contradicted by verse 21, which directly declares that the law is not against the promises of God. It is not the law that withholds the blessing, but it is the curse of the law; and this falls only on the transgressor; therefore the transgression of the law deprives the transgressor of the blessing of Abraham; and this is a strong confirmation of what we have proved from other scriptures; viz., that the law is the condition of the Abrahamic covenant, and that the faithfully obedient secure the promised blessings. And on the supposition that the law stands disconnected from that covenant, or is not the condition on which it was based, it cannot be shown why the transgressor of the law is not entitled to the blessing of the covenant without redemption from the curse of the law.

If this law had been kept by all, none would have been under its curse; and then no mediator would have been needed to secure to man the blessing of God. When the law is transgressed it is not set aside, neither are they who have transgressed it jus-

tified by future obedience. Then it becomes necessary to keep, not only the *Commandments of God*, the great and universal Law-giver, but also the *Faith of Jesus*, the Mediator between God and man, the Redeemer from the curse of God's violated law. In order to understand the Apostle's argument in Galatians, the object of this redemption should be kept in view, which is, that the blessing of Abraham might come on those who are redeemed. The covenant under which these blessings are given, was confirmed in Christ; as he is the seed to whom the promises were made, in whom all nations were to be blessed. Verses 16, 17. This is also shown, in verse 8, to be the gospel covenant. As the promises of the gospel were made to Abraham, he is constituted the father of all believers; and as before shown, the condition being violated, the blessing is conferred on those only who can claim them on the promise of God through faith in the Mediator. Compare Rom. iv, 12-16, with Gal. iii, 17, 18. In considering verse 19, we would refer the reader to our remarks on Rom. v, 20, where it is evident that the same law entered that was transgressed, otherwise it would not have the effect to cause the offense to abound. Here it is said that the law was added because of transgression. What was transgressed? Not, as some have vainly contended, the promise made to Abraham; for man cannot transgress the promise of God, though they can his law. It will be noticed that Paul does not introduce another law in verse 19, but speaks throughout of "*the law*," so we must consider him as speaking of the same law unless there is something in the argument which renders it positively necessary that another law should enter

or be added because of transgression. But in Rom. v, 20, it is seen to be necessary that the same law that was transgressed should enter to cause the offense to abound; so in Gal. iii, 19, when we inquire into the nature and office of the law that was added, there will be no difficulty in viewing it as the same that was transgressed. The law was added to serve as a school-master to bring us unto Christ, that we might be justified through faith: justification by the law being impossible by reason of transgression. Here it is evident that he refers to the moral law; for none but a moral law could bring us to Christ. He is the only Saviour from sin; and as the sick need a physician, so the sinful need a Saviour. But in order that the sinner come to Christ, he must be made sensible of his sinful condition; this can be done only by the law; for "by the law is the knowledge of sin." So "the law of the Lord is perfect, converting the soul;" perfect as a standard of right, convincing of sin, and thus bringing us to Christ, the way of salvation. Such conversion is genuine and complete. Thus it is evident that the law spoken of in Gal. iii, 19, 24, is a moral law, one that will detect and convince of sin.

But it is asked, was the law added to the law? No: "the covenant confirmed before of God in Christ" is the subject of the Apostle's discourse; and it was this to which the law was added. But it has been clearly proved that the law was also the condition of that covenant; neither was it added so as to become the condition of the Abrahamic covenant a second time, but as the condition of another covenant, the blessings of which did not rest on the promise of God through Christ, but on the obedience of

those with whom it was made. As they had all transgressed, by entering into a covenant of works, or obedience, their weakness and sinfulness was made manifest; and thus the law brought them to a reliance on Jesus Christ for freedom from the curse which they had incurred by disobedience. Through Christ the Gentiles also receive the adoption of sons, being Abraham's seed by faith, where there is neither Jew nor Greek, but all one in Christ; the Gentiles being "fellow-heirs, and of the same body, partakers of his promise in Christ, by the gospel," [Eph. iii, 6,] according to God's word to Abraham.

As the heir, while yet a child, differs in nothing from a servant, so we, before we were redeemed from the curse of the law, and received the adoption of sons, were in bondage under the elements of the world, and by nature the children of wrath, even as others. In what respect we were under the elements of the world, we learn from Eph. ii, 1-3. "Were dead in trespasses and sins; wherein in time past ye walked, according to the course of this world, according to the prince of the power of the air, the spirit that now worketh in the children of disobedience. Among whom also we all had our conversation in times past, in the lusts of our flesh, fulfilling the desires of the flesh and of the mind, and were by nature the children of wrath, even as others." Thus we see that to be in bondage under the elements of the world is being in a state of sin, which is compared to that of a child who is under tutors and governors; so we were under a school-master, under the law, which has been shown to be under condemnation. The following expression of the same idea from the pen

of Bro. J. N. Andrews, may be found in the *Review and Herald*, Vol. II, page 29:—

"The bondage of the Jewish church did not consist in that God had given them his law, but because they were its transgressors—the servants of sin. John viii, 33-36. The freedom of the children of 'Jerusalem which is above' does not consist in that the law has been abolished, but in that they have been made free from sin. Rom. vi, 22."

We have all been in bondage under the elements of the world, [Gal. iv, 3,] and Christ was made under the law, [verse 4,] to redeem them that were under the law, [verse 5,] and God hath given us the spirit of his Son; [verse 6,] wherefore we are no longer bond-men, but sons and heirs through Christ. Verse 7. The expression in verse 8, as we have shown, does not refer to the Levitical law. As that law was not contrary to the knowledge of God, it was never observed by those who had not the knowledge of God; its observance did not indicate "service to them which by nature are no gods," but was required in the service of the true God under the former covenant. Then it is evident that turning back to the weak and beggarly elements, to which they wished again to be in bondage, [verse 9,] would be returning to a life of sin. Neither does verse 10 refer to the Levitical law, but to the former customs of the Galatians, who were Gentiles or heathen; and therefore they could not have lived in the observance of the law given to Israel through Moses. This conclusion is not only reasonable, but unavoidable, when we consider that the observance of *times* was a heathen custom, strictly prohibited by the Lord at the same time that the law of Moses was enjoined. Thus

after the ceremonies of the law are described in Leviticus, it is said, [Chap. xix, 26,] "Neither shall ye use enchantments, nor observe times." That the connection to which the observance of times belongs may be clearly seen, we copy Deut. xviii, 9-12: "When thou art come into the land which the Lord thy God giveth thee, thou shalt not learn to do after the abominations of those nations. There shall not be found among you any one that maketh his son or his daughter to pass through the fire, or that useth divination, or an observer of times, or an enchanter, or a witch, or a charmer, or a consulter with familiar spirits, or a wizard, or a necromancer. For all that do these things are an abomination unto the Lord; and because of these abominations the Lord thy God doth drive them out from before thee." In 2 Chron. xxxiii, 2, 5, 6, it is said of king Manasseh, that he did "that which was evil in the sight of the Lord like unto the abominations of the heathen." "And he built altars for all the host of heaven in the two courts of the house of the Lord. And he caused his children to pass through the fire in the valley of the son of Hinnom; also he observed times, and used enchantments, and dealt with a familiar spirit, and with wizards." As we cannot believe that the Lord both prohibited and enjoined the same thing at the same time, we are led to the conclusion that the *times* of Gal. iv, 10, have no reference to the Law of Moses. And we can see no more necessity for referring the "*days*" mentioned in the text to the feast days and times of convocation in the law, than the "*times*." We find both these terms in common use, yet they are not used in the sense which is commonly attached to them in the

scripture in question. Many, even in the present age, observe both *times* and *days* according to the customs of the heathen, who would be startled at the thought of observing the rites of the Mosaic law; they will neither plant nor sow except at particular times, nor begin any work but on particular days. With them Friday is made an unlucky day, and Sunday a sacred day, both ideas being derived from the same source, viz., heathen superstition; but who dare argue from thence that it is wrong to observe the seventh day or Sabbath, which God has blessed and sanctified as a holy day?

Some may object that this declaration conflicts with the fact that the first-day Sabbath was instituted by the Papal power; but there is a difference between dedicating a day to the sun and giving it the place and title of the Sabbath or Lord's day. That the heathen were the first to consider the first day as a day of worship or sacred day, the Catholics themselves allow; while they plainly declare that "the church" "changed the Sabbath into Sunday!" The following testimonies on these points are from the *Douay Catechism*.

Ques. What is Sunday, or the Lord's Day in general?

Ans. It is a day dedicated by the Apostles to the honor of the most holy Trinity, and in memory that Christ our Lord arose from the dead upon Sunday, sent down the holy Ghost on a Sunday, &c.; and therefore it is called the Lord's Day. It is also called Sunday from the old Roman denomination of *Dies Solis*, the day of the sun, to which it was sacred.—Page 143.

Q. Why was the Jewish Sabbath changed into the Sunday?

A. Because Christ was born upon a Sunday, rose from the dead upon a Sunday, and sent down the Holy Ghost

upon a Sunday: works not inferior to the creation of the world.

Q. By whom was it changed?

A. By the Governors of the Church, the Apostles, who also kept it; for St. John was in the Spirit on the Lord's Day, (which was Sunday,) Apoc. i, 10.

Q. How prove you that the church hath power to command feasts and holy days?

A. By the very act of changing the Sabbath into Sunday, which Protestants allow of; and therefore they fondly contradict themselves, by keeping Sunday strictly, and breaking most other feasts commanded by the same church.—Page 58.

All will admit that the Galatians had been affected with Judaizing notions of self-righteousness; yet we trust it has been made plain that other errors were obtaining among them, having no reference to the customs of the Jews. If they "turned back" to their former practices they would again become heathen idolaters; but if under the influence of other teachers they resorted to circumcision, and looked to the law for justification, they were also under condemnation, being proved sinners by their own rule of justification, and this is the signification of the phrase, "under the law," as used in the letters to the Romans and Galatians. Then when it is asked, (Gal. iv, 21,) "Tell me, ye that desire to be under the law, do ye not hear the law?" an explanation is given in Rom. iii, 19, where it is expressly declared that "the law speaks to them who are under the law;" therefore they are they who hear the law; and the effect produced is that every mouth is stopped, and all become guilty before God. This, we think, plainly shows that the Apostle was convincing them of sin by the moral law; yet it has been supposed to convey a

different sense from its connection with the quotation in verse 22:—"For it is written that Abraham had two sons: the one by a bond-maid, the other by a free-woman." The scripture quoted is not written in the law, but in Genesis, in a record of events which transpired some four hundred years before the law was given at Sinai. There are those who contend that the quotation above was written in the law, and was what the Galatians were cited to hear; but again the same class of objectors will tell us that the whole system of law, moral, civil, and ecclesiastical, was unknown till after the exode from Egypt. How they will reconcile the two declarations, we are at a loss to determine; for if this scripture is any part of what was termed the law, then the pre-existence of the law is evident. But as this would prove altogether too much to suit our opponents, we will consider it admitted that the quotation in question is not taken from the law, but the two sons of Abraham are introduced as an allegory or figure of the *two covenants*. It is often taken for granted that this signifies the *two laws*; but such a position is not warranted by any scripture, as we propose to show. First, I am willing to rest upon the evidence produced that there has been but one moral law, and there never will nor can be another. And, the phrase "two laws" may be properly used to embrace the moral law of God—the ten commandments—and the ceremonial law, or law of Moses. The first, or moral law, called also God's holy covenant, was not one of the covenants alluded to by the Apostle; but it was the condition of both covenants; and the second, or Levitical law, was

not one of these covenants, but was appended to or connected with the Sinaitic covenant. Thus in Heb. ix, 1, where this covenant is mentioned, Paul says it had ordinances of divine service and a worldly sanctuary; but the covenant itself was complete before it had these ordinances, or ceremonies, and before the sanctuary was made.

Having already shown the difference between the two laws, it will be necessary in the further consideration of this chapter to contrast the two covenants. The Abrahamic covenant, (Jerusalem above,) of which we are made children and heirs by faith in Christ, has been so fully noticed that it will be unnecessary to go into an extended examination of that: a recapitulation of the points brought to view being sufficient. We have seen that its basis was the moral law; and its promises, the blessings of the gospel. All the purposes of God toward man since his fall have been manifested with direct reference to man's condition as a sinner; so this covenant appears as the development of a great plan of salvation; and as man has violated the condition on which the covenant was based, he has forfeited the blessings, so that future personal obedience is no longer sufficient to obtain them; but the obedience of faith is required. Faith must have some object on which to rest; Christ is set forth as a propitiation for our transgressions; and therefore the Mediator of the covenant. Then we have the covenant in full thus: the law for its basis, the gospel blessings for its promises, Jesus Christ its Mediator, and the heavenly Sanctuary his place of ministration, where he is em-

braced and the blessing secured through the obedience of faith.

The Sinaitic covenant we now proceed to notice. This may be found in Ex. xix, 5-8. The Lord sent a message to the children of Israel by Moses, as follows: "If ye will obey my voice indeed, and keep my covenant, then ye shall be a peculiar treasure unto me, above all people; for all the earth is mine. And ye shall be unto me a kingdom of priests, and an holy nation." The people sent back an answer, saying, "All that the Lord hath spoken we will do." But as yet they had not heard his voice, neither had he declared his covenant unto them: only they had seen what he did for them, how he bare them on eagles' wings and brought them unto himself. Verse 4. But the agreement was entered into, the arrangement made, and every thing in readiness for a declaration of *God's holy covenant*, the condition of the covenant made, or agreement entered into, with them. All should bear in mind the fact that the term covenant is used in reference to different things in the Bible: as a promise; [Gen. ix, 8-17;] agreement, [Ex. xix, 5-8; Heb. viii, 9,] or law; [1 Chron. xvi, 15-17; Deut. iv, 12, 13;] so that as in the chapter in consideration, a covenant or law may be given as the condition of a covenant or agreement made; and the signification of the word is sufficiently comprehensive to warrant such a use of it in the sacred writings: being, according to Greenfield, "Any disposition, arrangement, institution, or dispensation; hence a testament, will, or covenant." When they made the promise they had not yet heard his voice; but on the third

day thereafter the Lord appeared on Mt. Sinai and gave with his own voice the ten commandments; [Ex. xx, 22; Deut. iv, 12, 13, 36; v, 22-26;] therefore to obey his voice was to keep the ten commandments. Keeping his covenant was also keeping the ten commandments, as the following scriptures will show: 1 Chron. xvi, 15-18; Deut. iv, 12, 13; ix, 9-11; Ex. xxxi, 18; xxxiv, 28. These commandments are all that were comprehended in the expressions, "Obey my voice," and "Keep my covenant," as we have seen that these constituted the covenant which he spake with his voice, and wrote on two tables of stone; and it is said in Deut. v, 22, "He added no more." See also Jer. vii, 22, 23.

We have now before us the covenant with its conditions; and we next come to inquire into the nature of the promises of that covenant. It is generally supposed that these referred only to temporal benefits, and that these benefits were conferred according to promise. Against this view we have several objections to offer. As these blessings were conditional, if they were conferred according to agreement, it follows that they with whom the covenant was made either fulfilled the conditions, or had their transgressions atoned for by the mediators of that covenant. But the scriptures abundantly prove that they did not obey his voice, nor keep his covenant, [Num. xxxii, 14; Deut. ix, 6; xxxi, 27; xxxii, 20; Jer. xlv, 9, 10,] so that in their own persons they were not entitled to the promised blessings; neither did the priests who served under that covenant make an atonement for their sins; as the condition of the covenant

was a rule of moral obligation, for the violation of which the blood of calves and goats could not atone. Heb. x 1-4. We admit that they atoned for these transgressions in a figure, looking to Christ for the realization of the fact; and Christ is the only priest who has ever offered blood, having power to cleanse from the transgression of that law; and for this cause he is the mediator of the new testament, (covenant,) that by means of death, for the redemption of the transgressions that were under the first testament, they which are called might receive the promise of eternal inheritance." Heb. ix, 15. But this cuts off the idea that a temporal inheritance was contemplated in the promise, as the mediators of the first covenant did not take away sin, or secure the promises; and the mediation under the new covenant is for a different purpose: to wit, an eternal inheritance.

That this covenant did not embrace mere temporal benefits, is further seen by an examination of the nature of its promises and condition. The Lord promised that if they would keep his covenant they should be unto him a peculiar treasure, a holy nation. Now all the nations of the earth were sinners, and wicked in the sight of God, so that they would truly have been a peculiar people if they had kept the law of God: and they would have been a holy nation. This fact needs a careful consideration. We have seen that God's law is his own prescribed rule of holiness, and that this rule is eternal and unchangeable in its nature; that the requirement of holiness as the ground of acceptance with him is the same in all dispensations;

therefore it is reasonable to conclude that the reward is ever the same. Prov. xi, 19; Isa. xxxii, 17; Rom. vi, 22. God's ways are equal. Life and death were suspended on their obedience or disobedience to his law. Deut. xxx, 15, 16. But it is insisted that they could not keep the law, and therefore if eternal interests were suspended on their obedience, God was merely tantalizing them by placing before them blessings which they could not reach, and requirements which they could not fulfill.

We have thus far argued from the nature of this law, and the consequence of complete, perfect obedience on the part of Adam and all his posterity, while we have not expressed or intimated a belief that any one unaided by the mediator of the new covenant, could perfectly keep it since the fall of Adam, and the consequent corruption of the human race through him, their representative head. On the contrary, we believe that the Scriptures plainly teach that we cannot, independent of Christ, keep that law in its letter and spirit. If it were ever possible, since Adam's fall, for man to keep the law, no doubt that possibility still exists; and if so, inasmuch as the doers of the law would be justified, and life is the reward of obedience, (for the wages of sin is death,) then there would exist two complete methods of salvation at the same time—personal obedience, and faith in Christ. But this is not in accordance with the scripture which declares that when we were *without strength* Christ died for us; [Rom. v, 6;] and the Saviour says, without me ye can do nothing; [John xv, 5;] and again it is said, By the deeds of the law

there shall no flesh be justified in his sight; but the just shall live by faith. Rom. iii, 20; Gal. iii, 11. Much might be quoted to the same effect, but it will be sufficient to direct the mind to those scriptures which show the impossibility of escaping the wrath of God, if we neglect the salvation offered through Jesus Christ.

But while we admit the fact that they could not keep the law, we deny the conclusion that has been drawn from it, viz., that it was inconsistent for God to place a condition before them which they could not fulfill. When we understand the purpose for which the law was proclaimed as the condition of the Sinaitic covenant, we shall see that that purpose was accomplished; but it would not have been accomplished if it had been in their power to keep it. We turn again to the Apostle's argument in Galatians iii. He first shows the necessity of faith, and that the blessing of Abraham is bestowed on the faithful; that the law on which the Abrahamic covenant was founded being violated, all are under the curse; and Christ the Mediator of that covenant redeems us from the curse, that we may inherit the promise. At Sinai the law was confirmed to Israel as the condition of another covenant, to continue for a limited time, and the object of its being so given was that it might serve as a school-master to bring them to Christ. Now it must be apparent to all that if they fulfilled the conditions of that covenant, or kept the law, it would fail to bring them to Christ, and if it were even possible for them to keep it, it would lead them to trust in themselves, and seek for justification by personal obedience,

instead of seeking to the Saviour for it. The same fact is shown in Gal. iv, 24, where it is said that this covenant brings forth children to bondage, wherefore, it is fitly represented by Hagar, the bond-woman, the mother of Ishmael.

The two covenants are contrasted in Heb. viii, and ix. Some have supposed that the covenant mentioned in Heb. viii, 10-12, remains to be made in the future, in the administration of Messiah, when it is supposed he will be both King and Priest on the throne of his father David. As a correct understanding of this subject seems to be necessary to an understanding of Gal. iv, and as our present relation to the law is affected by the relation we sustain to this covenant, we will offer a few reasons why we cannot believe it to be in the future:—

1. Zechariah vi, 12, 13, refers to the present and not to any future dispensation. As this prophecy has been much relied on to prove the opposite, we will examine it. "Behold the man whose name is The BRANCH; and he shall grow up out of his place, and he shall build the temple of the Lord; even he shall build the temple of the Lord; and he shall bear the glory, and shall sit and rule upon his [the Lord's] throne; and he shall be a Priest upon his [the Lord's] throne: and the counsel of peace shall be between them both." In Rev. iii, 21, Jesus declares that he is now set down in his Father's throne, and is in expectation of his own throne. See Acts ii, 29-35. Paul says, [Heb. viii, 1,] "We have such an High Priest, who is set on the right hand of the throne of the Majesty in the heavens; a minister of the Sanctuary," &c. In the prophecy above quoted he is represented as

sitting a Priest on the throne of the Lord, "and the counsel of peace shall be between *them both*." This is fulfilled in the present position of Christ on the throne of God, a mediator between God and man. But he is to leave the throne of the Father, and cease to minister in the Sanctuary before he comes to earth. Therefore,

2. There can be no remission of sins according to the promise of the new covenant, after the coming of Christ. Without the shedding of blood there is no remission, and the blood of Christ is the only remedy to heal the breach made in God's holy law. This blood he offers in the Sanctuary and true Tabernacle which the Lord pitched and not man; and as there is but one offering, and this but once offered, [Heb. ix, 25, 26; x, 14,] so there is but one Priest who can approach the throne of God to make an atonement. 1 Tim. ii, 5.

3. A revival of the types of Christ's ministration is impossible. This we consider evidently true from the nature and object of such institutions: being shadows of things to come, or examples and illustrations of the work of Christ. No sin was remitted by the means of such blood as was offered in the worldly sanctuary, as it only pointed to a future fact: that fact being reached by faith, and realized when all the righteous with Daniel *stand in their lot* in the person of their Advocate. But such an order of things cannot exist after the priesthood of Christ closes. As the fact cannot go before the figure or type, or the thing signified before the sign thereof, it would seem to be absurd to make an atonement in figure for a sin which had already been atoned for in fact; and as

repentance and confession must precede remission, [Mark i, 4; Acts ii, 38; 1 John i, 9,] it would seem still more absurd to make a typical atonement after the sin was committed, when it had been done in fact, and remission granted, before it was committed!

4. The Apostle represented himself and fellow-laborers as ministers of the new covenant. We presume none will contend that the saints can be priests independently: they must act in a subordinate sense. Jesus Christ himself is the High Priest, and minister of this covenant according to Heb. viii, 1-6; and Paul says in 2 Cor. v, 18-20, that God "hath reconciled us to himself by Jesus Christ, and hath given to us the ministry of reconciliation; to wit, that God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them, and hath committed unto us the word of reconciliation. Now then we are ambassadors for Christ, as though God did beseech you for us; we pray you in Christ's stead be ye reconciled to God." It is written in 1 Pet. ii, 5, "Ye also as lively stones are built up a spiritual house, an holy priesthood to offer spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God through Jesus Christ." (Whiting, Macknight.) And again Paul says in 2 Cor. iii, 3, 5, 6, "Ye are manifestly declared to be the epistle of Christ ministered by us;" (prepared by our service—Whiting;) "Our sufficiency is of God who also hath made us able ministers of the new testament."

These and other texts of a similar import clearly prove that the present dispensation is under the ministration of the new covenant. It will be recollected that Paul says, *We have* such an High Priest

who is set on the right hand of the throne of the Majesty in the heavens; a minister &c.; [Heb. viii, 1, 2;] and in verse 6, "*Now hath* he obtained a more excellent ministry by how much also *he is the mediator* of a better covenant which *was* established upon better promises." And as the first testament was dedicated or ratified with blood, because a testament is of force only after the death of the testator; so Christ once offered himself to God, and is thus become the mediator of the new testament, that by means of death for the redemption of the transgressions that were under the first testament, they which are called might receive the promise of eternal inheritance. Heb. ix, 14-18. But it may here be urged that if the promises of the Sinaitic covenant embraced the blessings to be conferred by Christ on the faithful, then the promises of the new covenant could not with propriety be called better; but the difference does not consist in the blessings contemplated, but in the manner in which they were to be attained. The promises of Ex. xix, 5-8, rest solely on the obedience of those to whom they were made, without any provision for the benefit of the transgressor; and the ministration of the priests under that covenant did not release the transgressor from the curse attached to disobedience; because it was not possible for the blood of bulls and goats to take away sin; but this was all the blood they had to offer, so that if promises of forgiveness had been incorporated in that covenant, such promises could not have been realized from the ministration under it, and therefore no such promises were then made. But the blood of Christ cleanses from sin, so that the

covenant of which he is the mediator contains the promise: "I will be merciful to their unrighteousness, and their sins and their iniquities will I remember no more." In this respect alone was the first covenant faulty. Had its conditions been perfectly obeyed, no fault could have been found with it; true, it was insufficient to give life to the transgressor, but if it had not been broken, they could certainly have enjoyed the favor of God: or if it had embraced forgiveness of sins, and thereby have given life, no necessity would have existed for another covenant. See Gal. iii, 21. In Heb. viii, where the necessity of the new covenant is shown, it says, verse 8, "For finding fault with them he saith, behold the days come," &c.; and the reason is thus given in verse 9: "Because they continued not in my covenant, and I regarded them not, saith the Lord." He promised to regard them as a peculiar treasure, if they would obey his voice; but inasmuch as they did not obey his voice, the agreement was broken on their part, and the Lord was not bound by his promise to regard them as a peculiar treasure. Neither was it possible for him to regard them as a peculiar people, or holy nation, because that was not their true character. They were transgressors of his law, and of course sinners, unholy, like the other nations.

When we look at the nature of these covenants, and the object of their ministrations, it seems truly singular that any, with the truths of revelation before them, should argue that the law is abolished, because the old covenant has given place to the new, or because their ministrations are different. But as some seem to think that to change the

ministration of a law, is to change or abolish the law itself, we will still further notice this point. The promise of the new covenant in full, as given in the Old Testament, is as follows:—"Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, that I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel, and with the house of Judah: not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers, in the day that I took them by the hand to bring them out of the land of Egypt; which my covenant they brake, although I was an husband unto them, saith the Lord: (should I have continued a husband unto them? Margin:) but this shall be the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel; after those days, saith the Lord, I will put my law in their inward parts, and write it in their hearts; and will be their God, and they shall be my people. And they shall teach no more every man his neighbor, and every man his brother, saying, Know the Lord; for they shall all know me, from the least of them unto the greatest of them, saith the Lord; for I will forgive their iniquity, and I will remember their sin no more." Jer. xxxi, 31-34.

We now invite attention to a few facts connected with this covenant; and first, the necessity for its being made arises from the consideration that the condition of the old covenant was transgressed; and as it rested solely on obedience, after such transgression, another was needed embracing forgiveness of sins. Now if the condition of the first had not been broken, or if, after transgression, the priests under it could have atoned for sin, there would have been no necessity for another; for

the very purpose for which the new covenant was made would have been accomplished by the old. The new covenant was not based on the obedience of those with whom it was made, for then it would have been exactly the same as the old, but perfect obedience was rendered by the mediator, and our sins are remitted, and the righteousness of faith imparted to us through him. Rom. iv, 7, 8, 23, 24; 2 Cor. v, 19-21. So the law is not set aside, but honored and established. If forgiveness had been granted under the ministration of the old, the "holy, just, and good" law would have been dishonored, and God would therefore have been unjust. Under the new, God can be just—vindicate and maintain his law—and justify the believer in Jesus. Rom. iii, 26. A careful examination of these points, must convince all that the law is now the *rule* of justification (though not the means) as much as if no new covenant had been made: the developement of character according to the principles of this law, being the object of both covenants. This fact alone is sufficient to show the fallacy of that view that makes void the law of God through faith in the mediator between God and man.

We next inquire, Who was this covenant made by? The Lord, that made a covenant with the children of Israel when he brought them out of the land of Egypt; and when he made that covenant, he proclaimed the ten commandments as his law, and we have abundant testimony in the scriptures that they were acknowledged still to be his law in the days of Jeremiah, when the promises of the new covenant were made, which was

about six hundred years before Christ. Jer. vi, 19, 20; vii, 22, 23; xi, 1-10; Ps. cv, 10; Eze. xx, 10-13, 18-21. God, who made that covenant, and proclaimed the ten commandments as his law, promised to make a new covenant, and to put his law in their minds and hearts; and if the ten commandments were not his law when these promises were made, then the old covenant was a nullity six hundred years before Christ; as they were its condition. It must be admitted by all that they existed until Christ; and that they were the law to be put in the hearts of his people is the unavoidable conclusion unless it can be shown certainly that he referred to another law. But in no case where the new covenant is spoken of is there any intimation of any other law: and to render assurance doubly sure, Paul quotes the words of Moses respecting this law, and affirms, twenty-seven years this side of the ratification of the new covenant by the shedding of the blood of the Mediator, that the Gentiles are under the curse of the law, and by transgression are deprived of the blessings to be derived from this covenant, unless redeemed by Christ. Gal. iii, 10-14.

When Moses had broken the tables of the law, he was required to hew out or prepare two other tables like unto the first, and the Lord promised to write on them the words that were on the first tables. Deut. x, 1-4. Paul places the service of the new covenant in contrast with that of the old, and says, "Ye are manifestly declared to be the epistle of Christ, prepared by our service, (Whit- ing,) written not with ink, but with the Spirit of the living God." 2 Cor. iii, 3. As it was the du-

ty of Moses only to hew out the tables for the Lord to write upon, so the service of the ministers of Christ consist in preparing the epistle, and not in writing it: that is the work of the Spirit of the living God. Under the old covenant the law was written in tables of stone and put in the ark, but under the new, it is written, "not in tables of stone, but in fleshly tables of the heart." This is an exact fulfillment of the promise written by Jeremiah, and quoted by Paul in Heb. viii, 10: "I will put my laws into their mind, and write them in their hearts." Under the first covenant the letter of the law only was written on stones, (for this was all that the tables of stone could receive,) and they who were under that covenant served in the letter, which had no quickening or life-giving influence, but convinced the hearers of sin, and of course brought them under condemnation; [Rom. iii, 19, 20; vii, 9; Gal. iii, 19-24;] but under the new covenant the law is written in the heart by the Spirit of the living God, by which we are enabled to "serve in newness of spirit, and not in the oldness of the letter," fulfilling the precepts of the law in love, [Rom. vii, 6; viii, 4; James ii, 8;] and thus the Spirit quickens or gives life, while the blood of Christ—the "blood of the everlasting covenant"—cleanses from past transgression and "purges the conscience from dead works to serve the living God." Rom. iii, 25; Heb. ix, 14.

The law which was ordained unto life, the transgressor finds to be unto death; because it convinces of sin and holds the sinner under its dominion as long as he lives. Thus the letter kills by its condemning power, and the service of the priest-

hood under that covenant "which gendereth to bondage," is called the ministration of condemnation. We copy the following from the *Advent Harbinger* respecting "what Paul says in 2 Cor. iii, 7. He there tells us that the ministration of death, *written and engraven in stones was to be done away*; verse 7; and in verse 13 that it IS ABOLISHED; and, verse 14, IS DONE AWAY in Christ." We should not be surprised if a cursory reader should receive a first impression that the *Harbinger's* inference on the above text was true, viz., that the law of God was abolished; neither should we be surprised to find that a superficial view of some few passages of scripture should confirm the reader in the belief of universal salvation, or of the immortality of the soul; but for any to persist in that opinion after the accumulation of testimony which has been presented to prove the contrary, is strong, presumptive evidence that such persons love darkness rather than light. If no distinction had been shown between the law and its ministration, or if two different laws had been presented as the conditions of the two covenants, then the inference would be more excusable; but when the opposite has been plainly proved, we find no place for the *Harbinger's* conclusion. Let us examine the Apostle's language, and see what is the intent of his declarations.

"But if the ministration of death, written and engraven in stones, was glorious." The ministration means the service of the minister; so Whiting renders it in verse 3, and in the margin of verse 7; but this service was not written on the tables of stone; they only contained that which

the Lord spake with his voice when he said "nothing concerning burnt offerings nor sacrifices." It was the law that was written on the stones; so that we are led to the conclusion that the law is what the Apostle termed death; this may also at first sight, present a difficulty in the way of understanding the Apostle's words, but when it is remembered that the cause is often used for the effect, no difficulty whatever can exist. To show how common this form of expression is in the Scriptures, we will quote a few texts. In discoursing on the commandments it is said, "My son, let them not depart from thine eyes: keep sound wisdom and discretion, so shall they be life unto thy soul." Prov. iii, 21, 22. "My son, attend to my words; . . . for they are life unto them that find them." Chap. iv, 20, 22. "Set your hearts unto all the words which I testify among you this day, which ye shall command your children to observe to do, all the words of this law. For it is not a vain thing for you; because it is your life." Deut. xxxii, 46, 47. In Chap. xx, 19, it is said, "The tree of the field is man's life;" and in Chap. xxiv, 6: "No man shall take the nether or upper mill-stone to pledge; for he taketh a man's life to pledge." The Saviour says in John vi, 63, "the words that I speak unto you they are spirit and they are life;" and in Chap. xi, 25, he says, "I am the resurrection and the life." Col. iii, 4. "When Christ who is our life shall appear, then shall ye also appear with him in glory." When Pharaoh requested the removal of darkness, he said, "Entreat the Lord that he may take away this death only; [Ex. x, 17;] and when a poisonous herb was

found to be in the pottage of the sons of the Prophets, they cried out, "O thou man of God, there is death in the pot." 2 Kings iv, 40. It is evident that in all these cases the cause is put for the effect, or the means for the end accomplished, or to be accomplished; and if the law is called life, because it is ordained unto life, and those who kept it would live by it, with equal propriety it may be called death, because it holds under condemnation and causes the death of the transgressor. That which is justification and life to man in one condition, is condemnation and death to him when he occupies an opposite position.

It is written in Deut. xxx, 15, 16, "See, I have set before thee this day life and good, and death and evil; in that I command thee this day to love the Lord thy God, to walk in his ways, and to keep his commandments, and his statutes, and his judgments, that thou mayest live." In reality the law is not the life, (compare Gen. ix, 4; Lev. xvii, 14; Deut. xii, 23; and others,) but life is the fruit of keeping it; therefore it is evidently a figure of speech by which it is termed life, as the tree of the field or the mill-stone are called the life of man. In like manner it is called death, not that it is in reality death, but as Paul has said in Rom. vii, it was found to be unto death because sin slew him by the commandment. We have also seen that the letter only of the law was engraven in the stone, and it is expressly declared that the letter kills. We cannot suppose that these would have been death without sin, but there could be no sin without the law, for sin is the transgres-

sion of the law; and where no law is there is no transgression.

But if any doubt yet remains it must be removed when the Apostle goes on to contrast the ministrations of the two covenants, showing that the ministration and not the law is what he is speaking of that was done away. The service of the old covenant was called the ministration of condemnation, as being the opposite of the present work of the Spirit, which is termed the ministration of righteousness or justification. (Whiting.) Justification and condemnation are opposites; and we have seen that there could be no justification by the ministration of the old covenant; therefore it is fitly termed the ministration of condemnation. That was the ministration of men, of condemnation and of death; this of the Spirit, of justification, and of life. That was glorious; this excellent in glory. When that was instituted there was a glory reflected from the face of Moses; [Ex. xxxiv, 29-35;] in this is given "the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ." 2 Cor. iv, 6. That was with a veiled, a temporary glory, designed to be done away to give place to a ministration that was to remain, of glory that excelleth, where we with unveiled face behold "the glory of the Lord, and are changed into the same image from glory to glory;" [2 Cor. iii, 18;] as they are contrasted in Heb. vii, 23-25. "And they truly were many priests, because they were not suffered to continue by reason of death; but this man, [Christ,] because he continueth ever, hath an unchangeable priesthood. Wherefore he is able also to save evermore, [mar-

gin,] them that come unto God by him, seeing he ever liveth to make intercession for them."

They who have the law written in their hearts by the Spirit of God, under the glorious ministration of our Saviour, Jesus Christ, are made heirs of God and children of Jerusalem above; while they who have not the law in their hearts are in the same rank with Agar—the Jerusalem that now is—and are in bondage, or under condemnation, being in a natural or carnal state. They who are children of Jerusalem above are redeemed from the curse of the law and are therefore free; and they whom the Son makes free are free indeed. John viii, 36. This is according to the gospel of Jesus Christ which proclaims liberty to the captives. Isa. lxi, 1. Paul says in Rom. viii, 15, "For ye have not received the spirit of bondage again to fear, but ye have received the spirit of adoption, whereby we cry Abba, Father;" and again he distinctly states in Gal. iv, 3-5, that we were in bondage till Christ redeemed us from under the law that we might receive the adoption of sons. Again he says: "So then, brethren, we are not children of the bond-woman, but of the free. Stand fast therefore in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free, and be not entangled again with the yoke of bondage." Gal. iv, 31; v, 1. Although this "yoke of bondage" has been supposed to be the law of Moses, we find no intimation that the Galatians ever observed that law, or that it was the subject of the Apostle's argument. He does not even mention or notice the ministration of the old covenant, in Chap. iv, but contrasts the nature of the covenants themselves, and shows

the different conditions of those who are under them. We have found him convincing of sin by the moral law; proving that the Gentiles are under the law, from the curse of which Christ redeems them; and that by effecting this redemption he constitutes them heirs of the promise made to Abraham and children of the Jerusalem above; and we cannot see how any one can doubt that the bondage of the children of old Jerusalem consisted in that they were transgressors of God's law, the servants of sin; and the liberty in which we are exhorted to stand fast is freedom from sin—the liberty we enjoy in Christ while we follow that form of doctrine whereto we were delivered. Rom. vi, 17; margin.

As it is evident that none but the moral law is spoken of in Gal. iii, and that the redemption in Chap. iv, is from the curse of that law, if, as has been supposed, the Apostle speaks of the law of Moses in the first part of Chap. v, he has changed his subject very abruptly and without any apparent reason. But we think it is clear that the liberty spoken of in chapter v, 1, is freedom from sin, and that the "yoke of bondage" has no reference to the Levitical law; and if a change is made from the moral to the Levitical law, in verses 2-5, we must find place for another change when we come to verse 14; for the great principle there quoted, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself," is developed solely by the moral law. See Matt. xxii, 39, 40; Jas. ii, 8. Compare Gal. v, 18-23. But arbitrary changes of this kind are not allowable, as, if allowed, they would be destructive to the force of any argument that might be adduced;

therefore if such changes are made from one law to the other in a continuous discourse, a clear necessity will be apparent in the connection.

The main reason for supposing that the law of Moses is referred to in Gal. v, 2-5, is the fact that it stands in the text connected with circumcision; but this of itself can be no reason at all with those who have carefully examined the epistle to the Romans. "Behold, I Paul say unto you, that if ye be circumcised, Christ shall profit you nothing. For I testify again to every man that is circumcised, that he is a debtor to do the whole law." Gal. v, 2, 3. We learn from Rom. iv, 11, that circumcision was given to Abraham as a sign of the righteousness of his faith; but as the doers of the law would also be justified, if any did the law, they too would be righteous, and circumcision would to them be valid as a sign; for Paul says in Rom. ii, 25, "Circumcision verily profiteth if thou keep the law:" not a part of it, but the whole law; but if the whole law is not kept, circumcision becomes a useless and unmeaning ceremony; for, he adds, "If thou be a breaker of the law, thy circumcision is made uncircumcision." Therefore if they claimed any profit from circumcision they thereby acknowledged themselves in fact "debtors to do the whole law." No one can for a moment suppose that Rom. ii, either in whole or in part, refers to the law of Moses; yet the connection between *circumcision* and *the law* is the same as in Gal. v. And again it is said in Rom. iv, 4, that "to him that worketh is the reward not reckoned of grace but of debt;" but the works must be of such a kind as to merit a reward. The cer-

emonies of the Mosaic law in themselves considered, were of no esteem in the sight of God; and that law is declared in the Scriptures to be weak and unprofitable; therefore its works cannot be made a matter of debt, nor claim a reward. That moral duties are designated by these works is evident from the whole connection, and especially from verse 5, where the converse is shown: "But to him that worketh not, but believeth on him that justifieth the ungodly, his faith is counted for righteousness. Here the righteousness of faith is placed in opposition to the righteousness of obedience." Any comment that could be made on Rom. iv, and Gal. v, would probably fail of presenting so striking a parallel as is drawn in the texts; we will therefore place a few verses side by side:—

For I testify again to every man that is circumcised that he is a debtor to do the whole law. Christ is become of no effect unto you, whosoever of you are justified by the law; ye are fallen from grace. For we through the Spirit wait for the hope of righteousness by faith. Gal. v, 3-5.

Now to him that worketh is the reward not reckoned of grace but of debt.

But to him that worketh not, but believeth on him that justifieth the ungodly, his faith is counted for righteousness. Rom. iv, 4, 5.

Here it will be seen that exactly the same ideas are inculcated in the two scriptures: To him that worketh is the reward not reckoned of grace; but by grace we are saved, and no flesh shall be justified in his sight by the works of the law. Then to be made partakers of God's grace through faith we must renounce our own works and believe on him that justifieth. Such, and such only, are under grace; then if we seek again for justification

by the law, we are fallen from grace. But those who oppose God's law use this text as if it read, "Christ is become of no effect unto you, whosoever of you *keep the law*; ye are fallen from grace."

And they pronounce a curse on those who continue in the things written in the law to do them, instead of letting it rest on those who continue not in them, as stated by both Moses and Paul. But to render obedience to God's law while we seek to be justified by faith in Christ, through whom we receive "the remission of sins that are past," is quite a different thing from seeking to be justified by the law. See Rom. iii, 25; Eph. ii, 8-10; Jas. ii, 8-14; John viii, 10, 11; Rev. xiv, 12.

But it may be insisted that the Apostle means the law of Moses in Gal. v, 2-5, because it is an unprofitable law, the doers of which are fallen from grace, even while they are justified by it. We would then inquire in what sense he uses the word justify? Was any one, under any circumstances, justified by the law of Moses, or was justification ever coupled with that law? We think not. Nothing but a moral law can be a rule of justification; and the law of Moses consisted only in shadows, which were remembrancers of sin, but could never take away sin. They were not instituted as a means of acceptance with God, [see Ps. xl, 6-8; 1, 8-12; Isa. ii, 10-20; Jer. vi, 20; Amos v, 21-24; 1 Sam. xv, 21, 22; Heb. viii, 5; ix, 9; x, 1-4,] and were not included in man's *whole duty* to him; [Jer. vii, 22, 23; Eccl. xii, 13;] (for further proof of this we refer to previous remarks on the nature of the Levitical law;) therefore if the law of Moses is the law re-

ferred to in Gal. v, 2-5, it must be admitted that the word "justified" is used in an accommodated, rather than an absolute sense; and when it is shown that the term is used in an accommodated sense, we know of no further reason for referring this scripture to the law of Moses. But we are further inclined to believe that the Apostle does not speak of justification positively; as it is not possible to be absolutely justified and fallen from grace at the same time. We have before noticed that there are but the two opposite states: under the law, and under grace. To be under the law is to be condemned, but to be under grace is to be justified, and no one can occupy two positions at the same time. He who has fallen from grace, is, therefore, under condemnation; the very opposite of justification. We understand the Apostle to be speaking to those who desired to be justified by the law, and uses language equivalent to saying, Every man that seeks to be justified by the law is fallen from grace; and this is the sense usually attached to his words by those who have written on the text, even though they considered it the law of Moses. We give two examples:—

"And so far as any now seek to be justified by that dead law, 'they are fallen from grace,' according to the declaration of Paul."

"Surely those who turned from a living substance, the gospel, and sought justification by the deeds of a dead law of shadows, had 'fallen from grace.'"

The 14th verse of Gal. v, we have already noticed, as clearly referring to the moral law. By a comparison of scriptures we find that verse 6 also

refers to the same: making the expression parallel with that of 1 Cor. vii, 19, which says that "circumcision is nothing, and uncircumcision is nothing, but the keeping of the commandments of God." In Gal. v, 6, the commandments are not expressly mentioned. It says, "For in Christ Jesus neither circumcision availeth anything, nor uncircumcision; but faith which worketh by love;" but another Apostle informs us that "this is the love of God that we keep his commandments." 1 John v, 3. The remaining expressions in the epistle to the Galatians respecting the law, are not liable to a misconstruction. All language may be perverted by those who disseminate error; so Gal. v, 23 has been made to say, "*there is no law*," by cutting the sentence in two, and placing the writer's remarks between the first two and last four words, and then displaying these last words in capitals as a separate quotation; but by a perversion of scripture no more palpable than this, it can be proved that "*there is no God*," by keeping out of sight the fact that such a sentiment dwells only in the heart of the fool. Ps. xiv, 1.

Expressions are found in other writings of the Apostles, embracing important testimony on this point, which we have not time to notice at length; and so far as the present question is concerned, we do not consider it necessary. Many of these have been evaded by our opponents as not clearly defining the law of which they speak; and some of them alone considered are liable to such an objection; but taken in connection with facts otherwheres proved, their testimony is to the point. Thus, when John says that the love of God consists in

keeping his commandments, doubts have been raised as to what he means by the commandments of God; but when we trace the existence of certain moral principles back to the beginning, and find that Jehovah has made a declaration of these principles in a code of ten commandments, that these have been the basis of all his requirements, and that they are presented as a test of moral character and a rule of action to a thousand generations, even for an everlasting covenant, all uncertainty vanishes at once. Again, when he tells us that sin is the transgression of THE LAW, we look to the perfect law of God in the days of David, that which embraced the whole duty of man in the days of Solomon, which Christ declared was more firm than heaven and earth, and presented as the means of entering into eternal life, and which Paul has so clearly and ably proved to be of universal obligation in all dispensations; and we are at no loss to imagine what THE LAW is, of which John speaks so definitely; the transgression of which is unrighteousness or sin, and is unto death. When the perpetuity of the law is proved, that fact becomes a nucleus around which an overwhelming amount of evidence immediately clusters.

But the epistle of James demands particular notice. This is in perfect harmony with those to the Romans and Galatians, and contains evidence in itself that the law of ten commandments is the law of which it treats. No reason has ever been offered why James does not speak of the same law that is so often spoken of by Christ and his Apostles. It is admitted by all that Paul speaks of the ten commandments in Rom. vi; and in verse 23 he

says, The wages of sin (transgression) is death. James says also, [Chap. i, 15,] "Sin when it is finished bringeth forth death." So death is the penalty for transgression, and the time of its infliction is given in James ii, 12, where he refers us forward to the judgment, in connection with the obligation to keep the law. Now the sin spoken of in Jas. i, 15, must be the transgression of the same law that is referred to in Rom. vi: the penalty being the same, unless it can be proved that the "one Law-giver" will judge the world by diverse rules of judgment, which is an idea too preposterous to be entertained for a moment.

Again, it is very certain that the perfect law of "liberty" [Jas. i, 25] is the law of ten commandments; for David speaks of this law in Psalms xix, 7, and declares it to be perfect; and but one perfect, moral code can exist; and that cannot be susceptible of abolition or change. And again David says in Psalms cxix, 45, "I will walk at liberty; for I seek thy precepts." The bondage from which we are freed by Christ, is the servitude of sin; and if there had been no sin, all would have enjoyed perfect freedom. No law can be termed a law of liberty but one that would justify the doer; as any other law, if kept, would still leave the doer of it in bondage. The code proclaimed on Mount Sinai was perfect and was ordained unto life—it would justify the doer; therefore this alone is entitled to the name of "perfect law of liberty," unless another code equally perfect and comprehensive could be found.

Jas. ii, 8. "If ye fulfill the royal law according to the scripture, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as

thyself, ye do well." The only chance for opposition here, is to suppose that "the scripture" and "the royal law" are the same thing, which would be the same as to say, "If ye fulfill the royal law according to the royal law." But the Saviour has shown [Matt. xxii, 36-40] that all the law hangs on the two principles of loving God with all the heart, and our neighbor as ourselves. God once used the fourth commandment as a test of obedience to his commandments and his laws. Ex. xvi, 4, 28, 29. Paul evidently uses the tenth in the same comprehensive manner, to show that all impure desire is forbidden by the law. Rom. vii, 7. The two principles on which all the law hangs, are not dissimilar, but like each other; [Matt. xxii, 39:] and John uses the second principle—love to one another—as a test of love to God; [1 John iii, 17; iv, 12, 20:] so to fulfill that precept perfectly is to keep the commandments which hang on these two principles. Therefore it is said in Rom xiii, 8, "He that loveth another hath fulfilled the law." Macknight renders Jas. ii, 8, "according to *that* scripture." "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself," is "*that* scripture" according to which "*the* royal law" is to be fulfilled.

The Apostle next lays down an important principle, that a violation of one of the commandments is disobedience to the whole law. We cannot conceive how any one of the commandments can rest on only a part of the authority of the Law-giver, each one being as effective and forcible as though it was the only one in existence. Therefore whoever disregards one, as truly sets at defiance the authority of the Law-giver, as if all were disregard-

ed. To illustrate this fact the sixth and seventh commandments of the royal law are quoted: thus placing the identity of this law beyond a doubt. When Solomon presented the commandments of God as comprehending man's whole duty of obedience, he exhorted to the keeping of them from the consideration that "God shall bring every work into judgment." Eccl. xii, 13, 14. When Jesus instructed to keep the commandments he expressly declared that they were the condition of entering into life. Matt. xix, 16, 17. When Paul reasoned so forcibly to the Romans respecting this same law, he plainly declared that the transgressor should be judged by the law in the day when God shall judge the secrets of men; [Rom. ii, 12, 16:] and further proves that by these oracles, God shall judge the world. Rom. iii, 1-6. James, in his brief but irrefutable argument on the obligation of fulfilling this law, directs the mind forward to the same great event, and exhorts so to do and speak as they that shall be judged by the law of liberty. Jas. ii, 12.

And what more can the most sceptical require? Dear reader, if you are still in doubt, what amount of evidence will convince you? Surely you would not believe though one rose from the dead; for we have presented the testimony of God the Father, who declared this law and has ever claimed it as his own; of Moses the faithful servant of God; of the Prophets, and holy men of old; of Jesus Christ the Son of God, and of the holy Apostles. These delighted in the law, and have given their testimony in its favor. And in concluding we would again call attention to a few prominent and

important points clearly established on such authority:—

1. God's holy covenant of ten commandments existed from the beginning: having nothing in them peculiar to any dispensation, and were confirmed at Horeb for an everlasting covenant to Jacob.

2. The prophecies relating to the coming of Christ and the change of the dispensation never speak of a change or abolition of God's law, but on the contrary, speak in a manner to show its perpetuity throughout all time.

3. Christ expressly declared that he came not to destroy it, but to ratify; which he has done in his life, teachings and death.

4. The Apostles in the clearest and strongest manner have proved the perpetuity of the law, and that it is in all times a standard of right and wrong, by which is the knowledge of sin, and by which the world will be judged.

5. All the promises of the gospel are based upon it, and Jesus Christ, by perfect obedience to it, has secured the blessings which were lost by transgression, and imparts his righteousness to us, conferring these blessings on the obedience of faith, and thereby showing that the law runs parallel with the gospel.

That the Jews were rejected for their disobedience to this law, none can deny. The blessing of God, which they blindly supposed was secure so long as the Mosaic ritual was performed in the temple, was withdrawn. They were to be a peculiar treasure to him above all people, if they obeyed his voice and kept his covenant; but they broke

his covenant and he regarded them not. Their house was left unto them desolate. How fearful their fate when the word of the Lord was fulfilled; [Lev. xxvi, 14-43;] when terror and consumption was appointed to the transgressor; when the staff of their bread was broken, and they ate the flesh of their sons and their daughters; when they were scattered among heathen and their land desolated, till even their enemies were astonished at it. But a time more fearful than that is coming; for the Lord hath a controversy with the nations, and he will plead with all flesh; not Palestine alone shall be desolated, but the Lord will make the whole earth empty, and make it waste, and turn it upside down, and scatter abroad the inhabitants thereof; yea, the land shall be utterly emptied and utterly spoiled, for the earth is defiled under the inhabitants thereof: *because they have transgressed the laws, changed the ordinance, broken the everlasting covenant*; therefore shall the curse devour the earth. And this day is near—it is near and hasteth greatly. It is the day of the Lord's vengeance; a day of darkness and gloominess; of clouds and thick darkness, when the Lord shall roar out of Zion and utter his voice from Jerusalem and the heavens and the earth shall shake. Then shall the enemies of the Lord be confounded, when he pours out his fury on those who have so long resisted his righteous will, when sweet mercy is gone, and the vials of God's wrath are poured out upon this devoted world. Flee, O sinner! flee from the wrath to come! Escape for thy life ere the dreadful sound shall burst upon your ear. Soon God, in judgment will vindicate the honor of

his holy law. But mercy is yet offered. The voice of the third angel is heard, presenting the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus. Rev. xiv, 9-12. Who will engage in the great work of repairing the breach in God's holy law, that they may stand in the day of battle? The Saviour is yet pleading, and presenting his precious blood before the Father's throne; and although you have transgressed the Father's law, and are destitute of righteousness, he was without sin, yet he was made sin for us, that we might be made the righteousness of God in him. Hasten then to him as the only refuge from the coming storm.

"By sin we were exposed to wrath—
He died for us, that he might draw
Our wandering feet to virtue's path,
Where we may keep God's holy law."

Waukau, Wisconsin, July 4th, 1854.

THE TWO LAWS.

UNDER the Jewish dispensation were incorporated two kinds of laws. One was founded on obligations growing out of the nature of men, and their relations to God and one another; obligations binding before they were written, and which will continue to be binding upon all who shall know them, to the end of time. Such are the laws which were written by the finger of God on the tables of stone, and are called *moral laws*.

The other kind, called *ceremonial laws*, related

to various outward observances, which were not obligatory till they were commanded, and then were binding only on the Jews till the death of Christ.

There were also two kinds of Sabbaths, or days of rest. One was a day of *weekly* rest; and the command to keep it holy was placed by the Law-giver in the midst of the *moral laws*. It was called, by way of eminence, "THE SABBATH." The command to keep the other sabbaths was placed by the Law-giver among the *ceremonial laws*, because it was *like* them, as the command to keep the weekly Sabbath was *like* the laws with which it was associated. One class were fundamental, permanent, universal *moral laws*; the other class were local, temporary *ceremonial laws*. One had their origin in the nature and relations of man; the other in the peculiar circumstances in which, for a time a peculiar people were placed. One would be binding in all ages, upon all who should know them; and the other would be binding only upon the Jews till the death of the Messiah.

The Jews, at the coming of Christ, being in a state of great spiritual darkness and grievous apostasy from God, did not well understand the nature and objects of their laws. Often they overlooked the spirit, and were superstitiously devoted to the forms. Some, after they embraced the Gospel, thought that the ceremonial as well as the moral laws were binding. Others, more enlightened, thought that they were not. This led to contention among them. Paul, in the fourteenth chapter of Romans, presented such considerations as were

adapted to lead them, in this matter, to a right decision.

"One man," he says, "esteemeth one day above another. Another esteemeth every day alike. Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind. He that regardeth the day, regardeth it unto the Lord; and he that regardeth not the day, to the Lord he doth not regard it." Both mean to honor God, and he will accept them. But what day does he speak of? "The Sabbath" of the fourth commandment, associated by God inseparably with the *moral laws*? Read the connection. What is it? Is it, one man believeth he must worship Jehovah; another, who is weak, worshipeth idols? One believeth that he must not commit murder, adultery or theft, and another thinks he may? Were those the laws about which they were contending, and with which were connected the days that he speaks of? No: about those laws there was no dispute.

But, "One believeth that he may *eat* all things," (which are nourishing, whether allowed in the ceremonial law, which regulateth such things, or not;) "another, who is weak, eateth herbs. Let not him that *eateth* despise him that eateth not; and let not him that eateth not judge him that eateth, for God hath received him." Those were the laws about which they were contending, and with regard to which the Apostle was giving them instruction. It was not the *moral*, but the *ceremonial* laws; and the days spoken of were those which were connected, not with the former, but with the latter.

So, in the second chapter of Colossians, "Let no man judge you in *meat* or in *drink*, or in respect of a holy day, or of the new moon, or of the sabbaths."

The sabbaths spoken of are not the *Sabbath* associated with, Thou shalt not commit murder, or adultery, or theft; but the sabbaths associated with meats and drinks, and new moons, which were indeed, shadows of things to come. But to take what he said about those sabbaths which were associated by God with the ceremonial laws, and which the Apostle himself, in this very discourse, associates with them, and apply it, as some have done, to "THE SABBATH" which God associated with moral laws, is *wrong*.

"Blotting out," he says, "the hand-writing of ordinances that was *against* us, which was *contrary* to us, nailing it to his cross." But the day of weekly rest from the business and cares of this world, for the purpose of worshipping God and promoting the salvation of souls, is never spoken of in the Bible as being *against* men, or *contrary* to them. No: it always was, and always will be, *for* them. That Sabbath was made *for* man, not *against* him.—*Sabbath Manual*—pp. 133-136.

THE SABBATH.

TEACHINGS OF THE SAVIOUR.

BUT if Jesus Christ did not break the Sabbath, and did not say or do any thing which showed that it would be abolished, or the obligation to keep it holy be relaxed, why were the Pharisees so constantly at variance with him on this subject; and why did they so often accuse him of breaking

the Sabbath. Because they hated him, and because he violated their traditions about the Sabbath. The fact was they had added to the Sabbath law, as they had to other laws, numerous traditions of their own, and they regarded these more than they did the law itself. Thus they often made void the law through their traditions. These traditions Jesus disregarded, and showed by words and deeds that they were vain. He thus demonstrated that they were false teachers: blind leaders of the blind. This greatly enraged them, and led them to watch occasions of accusation against him.

For instance: they said, that if a son should say of that portion of property with which he ought to assist his parents, "It is corban," that is, a gift devoted to the Lord, he was released from his obligation to assist them, though God had commanded him to do it. Thus they made void the law of God through their traditions. So it was with the fourth commandment. They had added to it numerous and cumbrous errors, which tended to lead the mind to a blind and superstitious regard for *them*, and to overlook and disregard the spiritual meaning and real object of the Sabbath.

They enumerated about forty primary works, which they said were forbidden to be done on the Sabbath. Under each of these were numerous secondary works, which they said were also forbidden. These were so explained as to include works of mercy performed by Jesus, and thus to make him a Sabbath-breaker. Hence, they said he could not be the Messiah, for he did not, in the sense of their traditions, keep the Sabbath.

Among the primary works which were forbidden,

were ploughing, sowing, reaping, winnowing, cleaning, grinding, etc. Under the head of grinding was included the breaking or dividing of things which were before united. Of course, when the disciples broke off the heads of grain, and rubbed out the kernels in their hands, and ate them, it was a dividing of things which were before united, a species of grinding, which was, in their view, forbidden, and unlawful on the Sabbath-day.

Another of their traditions was, that, as threshing on the Sabbath was forbidden, the bruising of things, which was a species of threshing, was also forbidden. Of course, it was a violation of the Sabbath to walk on green grass, for that would bruise or thresh it. So, as a man might not hunt on the Sabbath, he might not catch a flea, for that was a species of hunting. As a man might not carry a burden on the Sabbath, he might not carry water to a thirsty animal, for that was a species of burden; but he might pour water into a trough and lead the animal to it. It was on this ground that they objected to a man's carrying his couch from the pool of Bethesda. Yet should a sheep fall into a pit, they would readily lift him out, and bear him to a place of safety. They would also loose an ox or an ass on the Sabbath, and lead him away to watering. Yet they objected to our Saviour's loosing a woman from her infirmity, though she had been bound by it eighteen years, and he could loose her by a word. Thus they "strained at a gnat, and swallowed a camel."

They said a man might minister to the sick for the purpose of relieving their distress, but not for the purpose of healing their diseases. He might

put a covering on a diseased eye, or anoint it with eye-salve for the purpose of easing the pain, but not to cure the eye. Hence the eagerness with which they watched the Saviour, to see whether he would heal on the Sabbath, that, if he should, they might accuse him. And when he did heal, and did it on purpose to show the futility of their objections, as well as his power to remove diseases, they were filled with wrath, and sought to kill him, though he showed from the Scriptures, and from their own admissions, that he had done nothing wrong. He stripped the Sabbath of the false appendages which they had attached to it, vindicated its divine authority and permanent obligation, pointed out its true objects and the proper manner of observing it, that his disciples, guided by his teaching and example, might in all ages remember it and keep it holy.

They would not on the Sabbath even take down the bodies of those who were crucified. Hence, they besought Pilate that the death of Jesus, and of those who were crucified with him, might be hastened by the breaking of their legs, so that their bodies might be taken down before the Sabbath began.

But, with all this scrupulosity, they could with wicked hands, crucify him, and impiously say, "His blood be on us, and on our children." With good reason, therefore, did he say, "Ye hypocrites, ye generation of vipers, how can ye escape the damnation of hell?" Without repentance of their sins, and faith in him as their Redeemer, they could not escape.

"But if the Sabbath was to be remembered and

kept holy, according to the requirements of the moral law, why did Jesus not say more about the keeping of it? Why did he not exhort them to rest from their labors?" Because it was not needful. As to external rest, they already kept it, and with superstitious exactness. Those who would not on that day heal the sick, walk on green grass, take water to a thirsty animal, carry a couch or catch a flea, did not need to be exhorted to abstain from worldly business. They knew that to be a duty, and of permanent obligation. What they needed was, to have the keeping of it stripped of the false glosses and superstitious observances with which they had encumbered it; to have the true object of the day, and the spirit with which it should be kept, pointed out. This was what he did, by word and deed, even at the hazard of his life.

Did they contend that hunger should go unappeased rather than that a man should pluck heads of grain, rub out the kernels, and eat them? He suffered his disciples to do this, and from the Bible vindicated their course.

Did they contend that the sick should not be healed, even by him who could do it with a word? He repeatedly did it: saying to the woman who had been eighteen years ill, "Thou art loosed from thine infirmity;" to the paralytic, "Stretch forth thine hand;" and to the man at the pool of Bethesda after thirty-eight years of confinement, "Rise, take up thy bed, and walk." They immediately did so—a most conclusive testimony from God that the silly traditions of the Pharisees were in opposition to his will.—*Sabbath Manual*.—pp. 213-218.

IT'S JEWISH.

WHEN we present God's holy law,
And arguments from Scripture draw;
Objectors say, to pick a flaw,
"It's Jewish."

Though at the first, Jehovah blessed,
And sanctified his day of rest;
The same belief is still expressed—
"It's Jewish."

Though with the world this rest began,
And thence through all the Scriptures ran,
And Jesus said 'twas made for man—
"It's Jewish."

Though not with Jewish rites, which passed,
But with the moral law 'twas classed,
Which must endure while time shall last—
"It's Jewish."

If from the Bible we present
The Sabbath's meaning, and intent,
This answers every argument—
"It's Jewish."

Though the disciples, Luke and Paul,
Continue still this rest to call
The "Sabbath-day," this answers all—
"It's Jewish."

The Gospel Teacher's plain expression,
That "Sin is of the law transgression,"
Seems not to make the least impression—
"It's Jewish."

They love the Rest of man's invention,
But if Jehovah's Day we mention,
This puts an end to all contention—
"It's Jewish."

E. F. O.

WHY DON'T YOU

KEEP HOLY THE SABBATH DAY?

A QUESTION

FOR ALL BIBLE CHRISTIANS:

ALSO

EXTRACTS FROM CATHOLIC CATECHISMS, &c.

PUBLISHED AT THE ADVENT REVIEW OFFICE,
ROCHESTER, N. Y.

.....

1854.